United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit



APPENDIX

ORIGINAL

76-1443

BPYS

IN THE

United States Court of Appeals

For the Second Circuit

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Appellee.

against

ELYAKIM G. ROSENBLATT,

Defendant-Appellant.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX

VOLUME I OF TWO VOLUMES

(Pages A276 to A563)

Kuh, Shapiro, Coldman, Cooperma & COND & Levitt, P. C.

Attorneys for Defendant-Appellant

800 Third Avenue

New York, New York 10022

(212) 688-7000

PAGINATION AS IN ORIGINAL COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Docket Entries	A1
Indictment	A4
Transcript of Testimony Motion for Judgment of Acquittal Requests to Charge Court's Charge Defendant's Exceptions to Charge Verdict Polling of Jury	A237, A419 A425 A489 A527 A543
Defendant's Requests to Charge	A546
Judgment and Probation/Commitment Order	A563
TESTIMONY	
Witnesses for Government	
Morris D. Brooks: Direct Cross Redirect Recross	A86 A156
David Hardoon: Direct Cross Redirect Recross	A168 A178 A198

		PAGE
Irving Fisch	her:	
	Direct	A204
	Cross	
	Redirect	A206
Matthew Ra	nkel:	
	Direct	A207
	Cross	A222
	Rebuttal, Direct	A413
	Rebuttal, Cross	A417
Eugene B. Z	Zambarda:	
	Direct	A228
	Cross	A229
	Redirect	A231, A233
	Recross	A232, A234
D.II. IV	Witnesses for Defendant	À
Rabbi Alter	Henach Leibowitz:	
Rabbi Alter	Henach Leibowitz: Direct	A277
Rabbi Alter	Henach Leibowitz:	
Rabbi Alter	Henach Leibowitz: Direct Cross	A277
	Henach Leibowitz: Direct Cross	A277
	Henach Leibowitz: Direct Cross	A277 A283
	Henach Leibowitz: Direct Cross mblatt: Direct Cross	A277 A283
Joseph Gru	Henach Leibowitz: Direct Cross mblatt: Direct Cross	A277 A283 A284 A287
Joseph Gru	Henach Leibowitz: Direct Cross nblatt: Direct Cross inzberg:	A277 A283 A284 A287
Joseph Gru	Henach Leibowitz: Direct Cross mblatt: Direct Cross inzberg: Direct Cross	A277 A283 A284 A287
Joseph Gru	Henach Leibowitz: Direct Cross mblatt: Direct Cross inzberg: Direct Cross	A277 A283 A284 A287 A287 A289
Joseph Gru	Henach Leibowitz: Direct Cross nblatt: Direct Cross inzberg: Direct Cross	A277 A283 A284 A287 A287 A289

Florence Fe		PAGE
Florence Fo	Direct Cross	A292 A295
Louis Hofm	an: Direct	A296
Chava Pech	ter: Direct	A299
Elyakim G.	Rosenblatt, Defendant: Direct Cross	
	Redirect	A394
Howard Bry	vks: Direct	A334
Sheldon Far	rber : Direct	A338
Raymond F	einberg: Direct	A340
Peter Lee G	ood: Direct	A342
Rosetta Bug	ggs: Direct	A397
S. Barry Wi	inet : Direct	A400
Abraham Fr	riedman: Direct	A402
Israel Hoffn	nan : Direct	A407
Seymour Go	oldberg: Direct	A408

TIA. AM

bsjb 1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V.

76 Cr. 142

ELYAKIM G. ROSENBLATT

August 12, 1976

(Trial resumed.)

(In open court in the absence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Juror No. 8, gentlemen, called this morning, Mrs. Mynna Brown, and said that she is ill, has diarrhea and will not be able to attend.

What I think we should do is perhaps substitute the alternate juror and proceed with the trial. She said that she would be at home until noon, at which time she would go to the doctor and try to get some medicine if it has not ceased.

MR. MacBETH: No objection, your Honor.

MR. GOLDMAN: The defense has no objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We will bring in the jury and proceed with the alternate.

We will have to take a brief recess. Not all

bsjb 2

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

the jurors are here, apparently.

(Recess.)

(In open court - jury present.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the court received a call from Juror No. 8 this morning, Mrs. Brown, that she has become ill, has diarrhea, and would not be able to attend court, and would probably have to go to the doctor today.

In order to proceed it is going to be necessary to substitute the alternate juror, James P. McEvady at this time as Juror No. 8.

Would you please proceed to that seat.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you may recall that when we recessed last evening the government had rested its case.

At this time we will now proceed with the defense.

Mr. Goldman, do you want to call your first witness.

MR. COOPER: Rabbi Alter Leibowitz, please.

RABBI ALTER HENACH LEIBOWITZ,

called as a witness by the defense, after having

been first duly sworm, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COOPER:

Q Rabbi Leibowitz, could you try in answering the

xxx

21

22

XXX

25

23

A

Yes.

1	bsjb Leibowitz - direct 273
2	Q Rabbi, could you tell us about how long ago it
3	was that you first came to know Rabbi Rosenblatt?
4	A As I said, it was I think more than 20 years
5	ago.
6	Q Rabbi, knowing him for these past 20 years, have
7	you had an occasion to form a personal opinion as to
8	Rabbi Rosenblatt's character in terms of honesty, in terms
9	of integrity, truthfulness and trusting other people?
10	A Yes.
11	Q Could you tell us what your opionion is in that
12	regard?
13	A Our school he was very close we had a
14	very close personal contact, as I do with most of the .
15	students, but especially
16	MR. MacBETH: Objection, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Yes. Suppose we have the reporter
18	read the question. I think perhaps you didn't hear the
19	question.
20	(Reccod read.)
21	THE COURT: Try to respond to the question.
22	THE WITNESS: Well, I think Rabbi Rosenblatt
23	is very trustworthy, he showed a great interest in the
24	moral and ethical teachings of our Torah and I felt
25	MR. MacBETH: Objection, your Honor. It is not

responsive to the question.

THE COURT: He is giving an opinion, I think.

Proceed.

You are giving us your opinion now, is that it?

THE WITNESS: Based on my experience with him, yes. And his interest in his studies.

He was -- showed very great interest in the ethical and moral values of the Torah teachings, and he maintained -- for that very reason he maintained contact with me throughout the years even while he had transferred to another seminary, because he felt that we are emphasizing these values of sincerity, of compassion and mercy; kindness, the human relationship, and he manifests great special interest in these areas of Torah education, and he enjoyed a very good reputation at our school, which is, as I mentioned before, closely-knit, and it is not a large school and we have very personal contact with the boys.

This was the impression, that I was under, that most of his friends at the school had felt that he anjoyed that reputation, especially in these areas, besides Torah scholarship, in the areas of human relationship, ethics and values and compassion, kindness for people,

Leibowitz - direct

human relationship, integrity and sincerity, and commitment to ideal of the Torah dissemination.

MR. COOPER: Rabbi, thank you.

(Continued on next page.)

bsjb

	5	A 283
1 B AM	1	bsb-l Leibowitz-cross
	2	CROSS-EXAMINATION
	3	BY MR. MACBETH:
,	1	Q Rabbi Leibowitz, have you heard the testimony
	5	in this case?
	6	A Testimony?
	7	Q Yes. The testimony of the other witnesses
	8	who have been on the witness stand in this case?
	9	A No, it is the first time I am here in court.
	10	Q Have you examined any of the exhibits that have
	11	been presen ted in this trial?
	12	A No.
	13	
	14	Q Before today, this is your first association
	15	with this case, the facts of this case, is that correct?
	16	A Well, I don't know exactly could you please
	17	define your question.
	18	Q Your coming here today and testifying is your
	19	first association or participation in any way with this
	20	Case, is that correct?
	21	A Well, I knew that Rabbi Rosenblatt had this

2 But you have not in any way been present during the trial or been associated with the trial?

problem some time ago. I knew about it.

No. A

22

23

24

1	bsb-2 Grundblatt-direct
2	MR. MACBETH: I have no further questions,
3	your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Anything further? If not, thank
5	you. You may come down. You may leave. Thank you.
6	(Witness excused.)
7	THE COURT: Next witness.
8	MR. COOPER: Rabbi Grundblatt.
9	JOSEPH GRUNDBLATT, called as a witness
10	by the defense, being first duly sworn, was examined and
11	testified as follows:
12	DIRECT EXAMINATION
13	BY MR. GOLDMAN:
14	Q Can you tell us what positions you hold or.
15	what positions you serve in now or in the past?
16	A I am the spiritual leader of the Queens Jewish
17	Center, that is in Forest Hills.
18	Q Do you know Flyakim Rosenblatt?
19	A Yes.
20	Q Can you tell us how long you know him?
21	A Well, at least three years, four years, maybe
22	more than that. But I am under oath, so I can't give an
23	exact figure, but a number of years, yes.
24	Q During that time have you observed him

and associated with him and had knowledge of him?

	A 28	78
1	bsb-3 Grundblatt-direct	
2	A Yes.	
3	O Do you know other people who also know him	?
4	A Yes.	
5	O Have you had occasion to speak to those other	her
6	people about Rabbi Rosenblatt?	
7	A Yes.	
8	Q Can you tell us, Rabbi, that based on your	on-
9	versations with other people, what is Rabbi Rosenblatt	's
10	reputation for honesty, truthfulness, morality?	
11	A Very good. I have known some congregants	of
12	his, and of course colleagues in the community that has	re
13	known him longer than I have, and they all have the high	ghest
14	opinion of him.	
15	Q And during the course of this time that you	1
16	have known him and known other people, have you come to	for
17	a personal opinion of Rabbi Rosenblatt?	
8	A Yes.	
9	Q Can you tell us what that opinion is that y	ou
20	have formed?	
1	A The same. As a matter of fact, I have tau	ight
2	Rabbi Rosenblatt Rabbi Rosenblatt runs a seminary.f	or
3	young men and women, and he has asked me to give some of	ourse
4	there, which I have over the past several years, and	

that gave me an opportunity to get to know him very well.

Grundblatt-direct

If I am permitted, I don know if it is proper, just a little incident, which I was unking about, it kept coming to my mind.

My remuneration was on a per diem basis,

I would give a certain number of lectures on a per diem

basis, and I vividly recall a situation, small classes

and one evening I came to school, it was a terrible evening,

a storm almost comparable to what we had the other day,

and none of the students showed up, and of course I waited

for ten minutes and I said to him, "Well, there is no

point. I am going home," and he insisted, he wanted to

pay me for that evening because I had come.

I said, "No, after all I didn't teach," and he just kept on saying, " You canceled other possible activities for the evening, and I ought to pay you."

And I was quite impressed. It didn't strike me as a person of greed and callusness who would have that moral sensitivity.

- Q Did you find him to be a trusting person?
- A Well, I didn't have occasion -- I didn't make him any offers, but --
 - Q I didn't mean that, just generally.
- A My impression was as a person, I would say he is that type of person, yes.

1	280
	bsb-5 Grundblatt-cross
2	MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you very much, sir.
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. MACBETH:
5	Q Rabbi Grundblatt, have you heard any of the
6	testimony in this case?
7	A No.
8	Q Have you examined any of the documents put in
9	evidence in this case?
10	A No.
11	Q Have you at any time been in the courtroom
12	and seen any of the conduct of this trial?
13	A No.
14	MR. MACBETH: I have no further questions:
15	THE COURT: Anything further?
16	M). GOLDMAN: No further questions.
17	1) 3 COURT: Thank you. You may come down.
18	(witness excused.)
19	MF. COOPER: Rabbi Abraham Gir berg.
20	ABRAHAM GINZBERG, called as a witness b
21	the defense, being first duly sworn, was examined an
22	testified as follows:
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. COOPER:
25	Q Could you tell us please what positions

	A 288
ı	bsb-6 Ginzberg-direct 281
2	you presently hold?
3	A I am the rabbi of Congregation Chofetz Chaim,
4	and the executive director of the Rabbinical Seminary of
5	America.
6	Q Wouldyou please tell us what the Rabbinical
7	Seminary of America is?
8	A The Rabbinical Seminary of America is a school
9	which encompasses students from various branches, from
10	elementary levels until post-graduate, the different names
11	and branches.
12	Q Rabbi, do you know Rabbi Elyakim Rosenblatt?
13	A Yes, I do.
14	Q Please tell us howlong you have known him and
15	how you came to know him?
16	A I have come to know Rabbi Rosenblatt some time
17	in the early faities as a student with me in the same semina
18	From them on, on and off we knew each other;
19	he was in a different seminary and came back, and we knew
20	each other through the years up until this day.
21	Q Since the early 1950's, sir?

Right.

22

23

24

25

Rabbi, do you also know other people who know Rabbi Rosenblatt?

Yes, I do.

	A 289
1	nsb-7 Ginzberg-direct 282
2	Q Have you had an opportunity to discuss with
3	
0	those people or converse with those people relative to
4	Rabbi Rosenblattt' reputation in the community for honesty,
5	integrity, truthfulness and being a trusting person?
6	A Perhaps it may have been such occasions, I
7	could not recall specifically, but I am sure there must
8	have been such occasions. I cannot recall specifically.
9	Q Do you know, Rabbi, and can you tell us what
10	that reputation is for those traits that I have mentioned?
11	A To the best of my knowledge, all the years he
12	has been an honest, sincere fellow, hard-working man.
13	He opened a school and a school for boys and
14	I sent my own son to study in his school for a period of
15	about a year, which shows that I have high regard for him.
16	MR. COOPER: Thank you, sir.
17	CROSS-EXAMINATION
.8	BY MR. MACBETH:
9	Q Rabbi Ginzberg, have you heard any of the
0	testimony in this case?
1	

have been introduced in evidence in this case? 24

No, sir.

23

25

Have you at any time been in the courtroom and Q

Have you examined any of the documents which

1 Ginzberg-cross bsb-8 Bernstein-direct seen any part of the trial of this case? 2 3 No, sir. MR. MACBETH: I have no further questions. 4 THE COURT: If there is nothing further, you 5 6 may come down. 7 Thank you. (Witness excused.) MR. COOPER: Louis Bernstein. 9 LOUIS BERNSTEIN, called as a witness by 10 the defense, being first duly sworn, was examined 11 12 and testified as follows: 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. COOPER: Q Rabbi BErnstein, would you please tell us 15 what positions you presently hold? 16 A At this time I am the rabbi of the Young Israel 17 of Windsor Park in Baside. I am an instructor at the 18 Yeshiva University. I am the president of the Religious 19 Zionists of America, an organization of some 20,000 20 supports of Israel. I am the past president of the 21 Rabbinical Council of America, and I am a former chaplain 22

(continued on next page.)

in the United States Army.

25

23

Bernstein-direct

ijpb

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

k 2A

Q Rabbi, do you know Rabbi Elyakim Rosenblatt?

A I do.

O How long have you known him?

A I know him for 21 years.

Q Rabbi, do you know other people who also know Rabbi Rosenblatt?

A I do.

Q Have you had an opportunity, sir, to discuss with these other people who also know Rabbi Rosenblatt, his reputation in the community for honesty, integrity, morality and being a trusting person?

A Yes, I have.

Q Please tell us what that reputation is.

A The reputation is an excellent one for integrity and honesty. In fact I would say exceptionally good, one who leans to the other side when in doubt.

Q Do you have a personal opinion of those traits

I just mentioned?

A I do.

Q Could you tell us what that is?

A I identify myself with that opinion.

Q Are there any specific instances of conduct that you look to in forming that opinion?

A Yes. He has called me in cases where either

.1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GOLDMAN:

Mrs.Fox, do you know Rabbi Rosenblatt?

I am a good one.

Have you had occasion to observe the Rabbi

24

25

Q

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Fox-direct cross

as a businessman?

A A businessman? The world's worst. He couldn't possibly be a businessman. I think he might like to be, but he is not. His head has been in the Bible and in the Torah all his life. I don't think he knows anything else. He has absolutely no conception of what the outside world is, of what business is or business acumen. This is my feeling about him.

MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you very much.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MACBETH:

Q Mrs. Fox, have you heard any of the testimony in this trial?

A No.

Q Have you examined any of the documents in this trial?

A No.

Q Have you been present in the courtroom at any time during this trial?

A No, I just came today.

MR. MACBETH: I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there is nothing further, you may come down.

(Witness excused.)

CONTHERN DIS SICT COURT REPORTERS, U.S. COURTHOUS

288 1 Hofmann-direct jpb 2 THE COURT: Next witness. 3 MR. COOPER: Dr. Louis Hofmann. 4 LOUIS HOFMANN, called as a witness by 5 the defense, being first duly sworn, was examined 6 and testified as follows: 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. COCPER: 9 Q Dr. Hofmann, would you please tell us something 10 about your educational background. 11 A Well, I received my B chelors degree in 1950. 12 I worked as a chemist for a couple of years, as an 13 electronics technician for another two years. Then I 14 went back to Graduate School at Michigan State University 15 and received my doctorate in educational psychology in 16 1965. 17 How are you presently employed? 18 I work for the City University of New York. 19 In what capacity? 0 20 I work in the office of special programs. 21 What do your functions involve in that position? 22 I am director of research for the office of 23 special programs. 24 What kind of programs are you involved with Q

25

there?

1	jpb Hofmann-d irect
2	A The office of special programs directs the
3	City University SEEK and College Discovery Programs.
4	Q Tell us what those programs involve.
5	A Those are programs for poor city residents who
6	wish to go to college and our program provides stipends
7	and special training in 10 units of the City University.
8	Q How long have you held that position.
9	A About the last two years.
10	Q Before that, what did you do?
11	A I was director of research for Essex County
12	College in Newark, New Jersey .
13	Q Were you employed in another manner before
14	that?
15	A Yes. Before that, when I first came to New
16	York I worked in New York University for one year and I spen
17	five years at Yeshiva University, Downtown Campus.
18	Q Dr. Hofmann, do you know Rabbi Elyakim Rosen-
19	blatt?
20	A Yes, I do.
21	Q How long have you known him?
22	A Approximately five years.
23	Q How did you come to know him?
24	A I methim through his wife, Thelma, who was a
25	graduate student of mine at the Yeshiva, and I was invited

1	jpb Hofmann-direct 291 Pechter-direct
2	trial than the few minutes you have been on the witness
3	stand?
4	A No.
5	Q You haven't been present when any testimony
6	was given or witnessed any documents?
7	A No, I have not.
8	MR. COOPER: No questions.
9	THE COURT: Any questions?
10	MR. MACBETH: No questions, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Thank you, you may come down.
12	(Witness excused.)
13	MR. GOLDMAN: Mrs. Pechter, pleease.
14	CHAVA PECHTER, being first duly affirmed,
15	was examined and testified as follows:
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. GOLDMAN:
18	MR. GOLDMAN: May the record reflect that
19	this witness has been here previously, your Honor, during
20	some of the testimony .
21	THE COURT: Yes.
22	Q Mrs. Pechter, do you know Rabbi Rosenblatt?
23	A Yes, I know Rabbi Rosenblatt very well.
24	Q How long have you known him?
25	A Approximately 20 years.

jpb

7 8

Q Do you know other people who know him?

A Yes, I know a lot of people, I met them through
the joint schools that my husband and Rabbi Rosenblatt
went to and I am also very friendly with Mrs. Rosenblatt,
and we are a close knit community. I know hundreds
of people who know Rabbi Rosenblatt.

Q Have you talked about the Rabbi to any of those other people?

A Yes, of ourse. Nobody believes what they have heard the last couple of --

MR. MACBETH: Objection, your Honor.

Q Based upon your conversations with these other people, can you tell us what is the Rabbi's reputation for honesty, truthfulness and morality?

A He is a very straightforward man who would never believe anyone would do anything that is not straight. It is beyond his comprehension. He endows everybody with the same qualities he has got and he is always helping the underdog.

Q Well, the next question is, have you formed an opinion of the Rabbi?

- A Yes, I certainly did.
- Q Tell the jury what your opinion is.
- A I think he is a very straight man. His only

	A 301
1	pb Pechter-direct 293 Rosenblatt-direct
2	trouble is he is always helping too many people without
3	selecting because he believes that everybody is worthy
4	and good and needs the help that he can give. This is
5	his goal in life, to help people.
6	MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you very much.
7	MR. MACBETH: No questions.
8	THE COURT: Thank you. You may come down.
9	(Witness excused.)
10	MR. GOLDMAN: Defense calls Rabbi Rosenblatt.
11	ELYAKIM G. ROSENBLATT, the defendant,
12	called as a witness in his own behalf, being first
13	duly affirmed, was examined and testified as follows:
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION .
15	BY MR. GOLDMAN:
16	Q Rabbi Rosenblatt, how old are you?
17	A Forty-three.
18	Q Are you married?
19	A Yes.
20	Q How long have you been married?
21	A Nineteen years.
22	Q Do you have any children?
23	A Yes.
24	Q How many?
25	A Three.

next old

Rosenblatt-direct

Can you tell us, boys, girls and ages?

A The older one is a girl, she is five, and the next one is a boy, he is four, and the baby is two years old.

Q Can you tell us, does your wife work or does she have a profession?

A Yes, my wife is a psychologist and she just earned her Ph.D. in psychology.

Q Can you tell us now your educational background and some of the positions that you hold?

A I have studied in Yeshivas all my life. I studied at the Rabbinical College of Telshe --

Q Raise your voice.

A Rabbinical College of Telshe in Cleveland, Ohio,

25 years ago, that is where I graduated high school. After

that, I was at the Yeshiva of Rabbi Israel Meyer Cohen,

which was for one year. I transferred to Lakewood, New

Jersey. Beth Israel Medrash Govosha of Lakewood, New Jersey,

where I studied over five years where I was under the

guidance of the great Rabbi Aaron Cutler.

After that I went to the graduate program of the Rabbi Israel Meyer Cohen seminary where Rabbi Leibowitz was the Dean.

Q What do you do presently or what position do you

A Yes. Yes, there is.

22

23

24

25

Mr. Hardoon I knew, yes.

How did you know Mr. Hardoon?

Mr. Hardoon used to come into our school and used to offer his services without remuneration and he

21 22

O Now, did there come a time when the subject of a check or the check came up?

24

23

the check and said if I could please do him a favor and have

Yes, Mr. Brooks, after our discussion, took out

25 this check cashed for him.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

298

- Q Was there any further conversation?
- A Well, I again asked hi, "Is it a good check?"

 He says, "You can see it's a government check and what

 can be wrong with a government check?"
 - Q Did you agree to help try to cash it for him?
- A Yes, I did. I had known the whole time he had led a tragic life and I know everybody was trying to help him. In fact, collections were made for him while he lived in Garden Hills to help him pay his rent to help him bring up his children because there was no mother and the word was that everybody should always try to help Morris Brooks and I wanted to do my share.
- Q Now, Rabbi, at that time, did he tell you anything about people trying to hide this money?
 - A No.
- Q Did he tell you anything about people trying to evade taxes?
- A The word tax, t-a-x, was never mentioned in any of our transactions, never.
- Q Did you say that you would not cash it for him unless he agreed to pay you something?
- A I did not ask him for a nickel. I did it only as a favor. I expected nothing for it in return.
 - Q Did you say you had to call your accountant?

A I did not say -- did not mentio. calling an accountant. Maybe I mentioned I should have been an accountant, but not to call one.

Q Now, did Mr. Brooks offer you any explanation about how he happened to have this check or what it was?

A Well, Mr. Brooks mentioned he had something. I don't recall whether it was at that first transaction or at the second. But he did mention the following: He said that the check, the ticker in the Post Office that makes out the names to the checks made a mistake and it should have written incorporated after the name. The ticker made a mistake and omitted the word incorporated.

The people who had these checks didn't want to wait and mail it back to the Post Office to have it credited because this would take some six months to a year until it goes through the red tape and these people wanted cash for it right away.

- Q Did you ask him any further questions after that?
 - A No, I didn't.
- Q Did he ever make any other explanation after that?
 - A No, he didn't.
 - Q Did you have any knowledge that anything was

Q What happened then?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, I insisted that he get \$10,000 because he deposited \$10,000 and I wanted to return \$10,000. He said no. I should only make out this one check and that's it.

Did you subsequently give him any more money?

Yes. When I got home or the next day or maybe two days after that, I felt very badly that he had deposited \$10,000 into my account and I only returned \$9,000, but I also realized that he wanted us to have

Rosenblatt	- direct
Rosenblati	r - arrect

jpjb 5

Rabbinical College of Queens?

302

3

1

2

A Yes.

4

Q Do you recall the amount of the second check?

5

A \$9,700; I'm not sure.

6

7

8

Q Let me show you what's been marked as Government's Exhibit 10. Can you identify that as the check
that Morris Brooks came to you on the second occasion
with?

9

A Yes.

10

Q I direct your attention to the back of this check, did you place a stamp on that check?

12 13

A Yes, I placed a stamp on the Rabbinical College of Queens.

14 15

Q Was that check deposited in the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens?

16 17

A Yes, it was.

18

19

20

Q Now, let me ask you this. On the first, second third or on any occasion, did you make any attempt to secrete whatever participation you had with regard to cashing of these checks?

21

MR. MacBETH: Objection, your Honor, it calls for the mental process of the witness.

22 23

THE COURT: Yes. It calls for a conclusion on the part of the witness.

	A 311
1	jpjb 6 Rosenblatt - direct 303
2	Q Rabbi, did you go to the Chase Manhattan Bank?
3	A Yes, I did.
4	Q Were you known there?
5	A Yes, I was.
6	Q Did you know Mr. Rankel?
7	A Yes, I did.
8	Q Had you done business with Mr. Rankel?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Did you take any steps whatsoever to attempt to
11	insure that Mr. Rankel would not know what you were doing?
12	A No, I did not.
13	MR. MacBETH: Same objection.
14	THE COURT: Well, you can cross examine him on
15	it.
16	Q Did you place the stamp of the college on the bac
17	of the check?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Did you ever agree with Morris Brooks to tell
20	Mr. Rankel any kind of false story about how come you were
21	cashing these checks ever?
22	A No, I did not.
23	Q Did you ever tell Mr. Rankel that Morris Brooks
24	had loaned money to the college and this was repayment of

a loan?

	A 312
1	jpjb 7 Rosenblatt - direct 304
2	A No, I didn't.
3	Q You simply went in and deposited the checks?
4	A And asked Mr. Rankel to cash it for Morris
5	Brooks.
6	Q And on a number of occasions, was Mr. Rankel
7	present when the money was given to Mr. Brooks?
8	A At all the occasions because Mr. Rankel took us
9	both into the bank, into the conference room and he counted
10	out the money and handed the money afterwards to Morris
11	Brooks.
12	Now, on that second transaction, the check was
13	for \$9700, could you tell us how much the Rabbinical
14	College got by virtue of Mr. Brooks' generosity?
15	A The checks that were issued in return for that
16	was a \$6,000 check and some \$3,000 check, 3200, I'm not
17	sure exactly. The Rabbinical College of Queens was left
18	with something like \$500.
19	Q Now, again, Rabbi, let me ask you: At any time
20	did Morris Brooks ever tell you that the payees on these
21	checks were trying to hide this money from the government?
22	A Absolutely not.
23	Q At any time did he ever tell you that any of
24	these people were trying to evade their taxes?

Absolutely not.

1	jpjb 9 Rosenblatt - direct A 314
2	Do you recall the next transaction and let me
3	show you what's been marked as Government's Exhibit 11.
4	A Yes.
5	Q Do you have any recollection of what occurred
6	with regard to that one?
7	A Well, the same thing. He called me before that
8	he had the check and either he came himself or he sent
9	Mr. Hardoon over with the check.
10	We deposited it; after it cleared, we issued
11	our check back to him.
12	Q On that occasion do you recall the amount of
13	the check that you issued back to him?
14	A I think it was something like 24,000.
15	Q Let me show you what's been marked as Government's
16	Exhibit 12. Is that the check that was issued?
17	A Yes.
18	Q That was issued by the Rabbinical College?
19	A Yes.
20	Q What was the amount?
21	A 24,200.
22	Q Was that pursuant to a conversation with Morris
23	Brooks?
24	A Well, Morris Brooks told me what to make the
25	check out for.

MR. MacBETH: Could we omit the repetition?

THE COURT: Yes. The proper question to the

It was deposited to the Rabbinical College?

First, do you have any recollection with regard

323-

to the check of the United States, do you have anything with regard to that transaction, any recollection?

A Yes. We deposited this check of \$24,600 and after it cleared for three days Morris Brooks came to me. I issued a check to him which he turned to cash.

- Q What was the amount of the check issued by the college?
 - A \$24,600.
 - Q The exact amount?
 - A Yes, the exact amount.
- Q Can you tell us how it was that the check was issued in that amount?

A Well, as I was making out the check Mr. Morris
Brooks always told me the amount to make it in. As I
was making out this check, he was quiet, he didn't say
anything. So I presumed --

MR. MacBETH: Objection. We are now getting into the mental process of the witness.

THE COURT: Yes. Tell us only what actually occurred, that is what you said and what you did.

A What actually occurred, as I was making out the check, he did not tell me this time --

MR. MacBETH: Objection. We can't have what he didn't say.

THE COURT: Yes, objection sustained.

24

25

issues before the jury.

MR. GOLDMAN: May we have a conference at the side bar?

THE COURT: Yes.

(At the side bar.)

MR. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, yesterday Mr. MacBeth put into evidence a safe deposit note indicating visits to a safe deposit box. If Mr. MacBeth tells me he is not going to go into that when he went into the safe deposit box, I'll drop the issue.

MR. MacBETH: What he finally did is perfectly admissible. If we are going to have a speech of spending it for the poor children, or something of that sort, that is what I will object to.

If it is simply deposited here and a check for it, and that sort, I have no objection to it.

MR. GOLDMAN: If Mr. MacBeth is going to use that fact to raise a negative implication agains e Rabbi, the Rabbi is entitled to explain what he did with the money.

THE COURT: Yes, I think there was evidence yesterday which tended to show that he put the money into a safe deposit box.

MR. MacBETH: That's correct.

THE COURT: So that the defense can bring out

Rosenblatt - direct

where he put the money or what he did with it.

(In open court.)

jpjb 16

(Continued on next page.)

3

1

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BY MR. GOLDMAN:

Q Rabbi, what did you do with the cash which you received on that occasion?

A The cash was deposited in a safety deposit box at that same bank.

Q Can you tell us what if anything was done with the money that was put in that safe deposit box?

A Yes. That money was maintained for the charity cash fund that the Rabbinical College has had for many years.

Q Can you describe what that fund is?

MR. MacBETH: Ob jection, your Honor. This goes beyond the --

THE COURT: Yes. Sustained.

MR. GOLDMAN: I think Mr. MacBeth is going to try to make something of the fact that the money was put in a box, and I think the witness should be able to tell us --

THE COURT: He has told us that the money went to a charity fund, the cash fund.

THE WITNESS: Right.

Incidentally, on all of the transactions that we have discussed, on the checks that I have now asked you about, did you place a stamp on the back of the check?

checks that we issued and returned to be broken down. I took the checkbook of Rabbinical College of Queens to the bank and as I appeared together with Mr. Brooks before Mr. Rankel, I opened the checkbook and I asked Mr. Rankel, the deposit is 38,500, if you might please tell me how to break this down.

Q Did Mr. Rankel tell you the amounts to write the checks out for?

A Yes, Mr. Rankel told me exactly to make one check for one amount and the second check for another amount and the third check for another amount. That equaled \$38,500.

Q Did you hear Mr. Brooks testify yesterday that those checks were broken down to try and hide what was going on?

MR. MacBETM: Objection, your Honor. That misstates the record. I withdraw it.

Q Did you hear Mr. Brooks testify yesterday that the checks were broken down in three checks to try and hide what was going on?

A Yes.

Q It is your testimony that Mr. Rankel told you to do that?

A Yes.

1	bsjb Rosenblatt - direct 317
2	Q In what amounts did you make out the checks?
3	A I don't remember.
4	MR. MacBETH: If there's going to be a discussion
5	between the counsel and the witness, would we have it out
6	loud.
7	MR. GOLDMAN: Mr. MacBeth, if you hadn't thrown
8	the checks at me and mixed them up I could have gone
9	through the numbers.
10	THE WITNESS: The first check was one check
11	was \$12,000, the other check was \$12,000 and the other
12	check was \$14,500.
13	Q The total of those three checks, did that
14	A \$38,500.
15	Q The amount of the government check?
16	A \$38,500.
17	Q At any time with regard to this transaction,
18	had you asked Morris Brooks for anything?
19	A No, I didn't.
20	Q After the checks were cashed did he give you
21	anything?
22	A Yes, he did.
23	Q Can you recall what if anything he gave you?
24	A Around \$1,000.
25	O What did you do with that

A 326 1 bsjb Rosenblatt - direct 318 2 That money was deposited into the charity cash 3 fund, in the safe deposit box. 4 O I believe there is one more transaction. Can 5 you recall the amount of that check? 6 A \$41,500. 7 Q Can you tell us what that again -- was that 8 stamped? 9 A Yes. 10 Q What was that stamp? 11 A No, there is no stamp on this one. Written in, 12 Rabbinical College of Queens. I recall -- I just noticed 13 it now the first time, I recall that when we went to the 14 bank, we had forgotten to stamp it, so I just signed 15 Rabbinical College of Queens at the bank. 16 Q At the bank did you write out checks against it 17 that day or on another day? 18 A Yes. Again, Mr. Rankel had wanted us to bring 19 the checkbook so he could tell us the amounts to be broken 20 up. I brought the checkbook and he told us again how 21 to break down the checks. 22 Q Do you recall the amounts of the checks that 23 you subsequently wrote? 24 A \$17,350, \$12,150, and 12,000. That should equal 25 41,500.

you instruct the witness not to answer the question when

THE COURT: Yes. Permit the United States

Attorney to make his objection before you answer the question.

MR. MACBETH: It is both repetitious and leading.

MR. GOLDMAN: I have never heard that a defendant is not allowed to deny the commission of the crime
he is charged with, or he is not allowed to refute the
testimony of a Government witness. That is all this is.

MR. MACBETH: He is certainly allowed to testify in a proper form, to anything that the defense attorney wants to put to him that is relevant. This question is repetitious, it has been asked at least four times.

It is also asked consistently in a leading manner rather than asking what the conversations in fact were.

THE COURT: Yes, the proper form of the question should be, what did Morris Brooks say to you and what did you say to him on each occasion? And then let the witness tell what was said.

MR. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I think the witness should be entitled to make a specific denial instead of being left to presume that maybe he just didn't remember what was said or something.

MR. MACBETH: Mr. Goldman had him make the

bsb-2 Rosenblatt-direct

2

denial a number of times on this record already, your Honor.

3

MR. GOLDMAN: There are eight checks, and yesterday the Government witness was asked repeatedly

6

5

over and over again --

7

tion in terms of did it ever happen, did it ever happen,

8

and it is patently improper.

10

MR. GOLDMAN: I will do it check by check, Mr.

MR. MACBETH: He has repeatedly asked the ques-

11

Macbeth.

12

Q Rabbi, take a look at the Government checks in

13

front of you. Take eachcheck, read the number on the bottom

14

and tell the jury if at any time with regard to any of .

15

those checks Morris Brooks ever told you the people were

16

trying to hide money, the people were trying to evade

17

taxes, it was kickback or it was payola.

18

MR. MACBETH: That question is repetitious.

19

If you would like to ask the witness what the conversations

20

were in relation to each of those checks, he is certainly

21

entitled to do so. But he has asked this question on

22

THE COURT: I will let him answer the

23

question.

more than one occasion.

25

A Should I put them in order?

b	S	b	_	3
~	~	~		-

Rosenblatt-direct

Q No. Just read the number and as to each check, if at any time Morris Brooks ever told you that those people were trying to hid that money from the Government, evade taxes, that it was a kickback or payola to those people.

A The check of July 14, 1975, \$38,500, Mr. Morris

Brooks never told me that there was any tax-- anybody hiding

any taxes or any payola or kickbacks, never mentioned one

word about it regarding this check.

Regarding the check March 17, 1975, \$32,000.

Mr. Morris Brooks never mentioned one word about anybody
hiding taxes, payola, kickback or anything wrong.

- Q Rabbi, would your answer be the same --
- A For all the checks.
- Q -- with regard to each and every check which has been placed in evidence?
 - A Yes.
 - Q By the United STates Government.
 - A Yes.
- Q Rabbi, let me ask you, at any time did you intended to defraud the Government of the United States?
 - A No.

MR. MACBETH: Objection, your Honor. That calls for the mental process --

11					
11	2-	_	1		1
11	b	S	D	-	4

Rosenblatt-direct

MR. GOLDMAN: It is a specific denial to the specific charge made and I think the witness is entitled to deny it.

THE COURT: I will permit him to answer the question.

O At any time, by any means, for whatever purpose, or in any manner, did you, together with Morris Brooks, or did you intend to defraud the Government of the United States?

A Absolutely not.

At any time did you have any knowledge that there was any impropriety connected with the obtaining or cashing of these checks?

A Absolutely not.

Q At any time did you have any idea that the Government of the United States would be defrauded with regard to the receipt of taxes as the result of your agreeing to cash those checks?

MR. MACBETH: Objection, your Honor. It is becoming conclusory, calling for the mental process of a witness, leading the witness. It is a totally improper question.

THE COURT: I will let him answer the question.

A Absolutely not.

1	bsb-	

Rosenblatt-direct

Q At any time did you conspire with Morris Brooks to commit any crime, to your knowledge?

A Absolutely not.

MR. GOLDMAN: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: All right. At this time we will take a 15-minute recess. The jury is excused --

MR. COOPER: Before we do that, may we step up for a moment?

THE COURT: All right.

(At the side bar.)

MR. COOPER: I was just outside, one of our character witnesses is here, he told me last night his wife was due on Monday. This morning she went into labor. Our request would be first if we could take him out of order, and second, if we could take him for a few minutes before the recess.

THE COURT: All right.

(In open court.)

THE COURT: The defense counsel has requested an opportunity to call a witness out of turn so he can return to his home because of his wife's condition.

At this time, instead of recessing, we are not going to proceed with the Government's cross-examination, to which there is no objection, and we will take the

1	bsb-6 Bryks-direct
2	character witness at this time.
3	
	(Witness temporarily excused.)
4	HOWARD BRYKS, called as a witness by the
5	- defense, being first duly affirmed, was examined
6	and testified as follows:
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. COOPER:
9	Q Mr.Bryks, could you tell us how you are
10	employed, please?
11	A I am a New York City branch manager for Scienti
12	fic Timesharing.
13	Q What are your duties there?
14	A We sell computer time and programming services.
15	Q What are your duties with that company?
16	A I manage a team ot six salesmen and programmers
17	in the New York City area who are responsible for supporting
18	the users of our computer service.
19	Q What is the nature of your educational back-
20	
21	ground, sir?
	A I have a Bachelors degree in mathematics from
22	Computer Science and a Master of Science from NYU.
23	Q Do you know Rabbi Elyakim Rosenblatt?
24	A Yes, I do.
25	O Do you have a family Mr Bruke?

1
1
2
4
3
0
4
4
5
J
6
0
7
8
0
9
10
11
11
12
13
14
14
15
16
10
17
11
18
10
19
20
0.
21
00
22
23
2
ω
ω
24

Bryks-direct

A Yes, I do. I have a son aged two and a half and my wife is currently in labor awaiting a second one.

- O Mr. Bryks, do you know Rammi Rosenblatt?
 - A I do.

bsb-7

Q In what capacity do you know him and for how long?

A I am a congregant in his synagogue and I have known him for approximately one year.

Q Do you know other people who also know Rabbi Rosenblatt?

A I do.

Q Have you had occasion to discuss with those people Rabbi Rosenblatt's reputation for honesty, integrity, morality and for trusting others?

A Yes, I have. On several occasions both before and after the incident, yes.

- Q Can you tell us what that reputation is?
- A The reputation is for extreme honesty, high ethics and one of modesty and simplicity as well.
- Q Do you have a personal opinion as to those characteristics of Rabbi Rosenblatt?

A Yes, I agree with the community entirely in those respects, and I feel him to be an upstanding indivisual, highly moral and ethical.

bsb-8

Bryks-direct

Q Is there any specific conduct or instances in your relationship with Rabbi Rosenblatt that you can point to in forming that opinion?

A There are several incidents. Most of them are minor so they tend to form a global pictur e of the individual as opposed to one incident that stands out by itself.

An example of such an incident might be the case where I was sponsoring something called a kiddish, which is a little party after services in the synagogue, where the Rabbi made all the arrangements for me in purchasing all the food. When I asked him how much it would cost me, he tendered a bill that was exactly equal to his expenses, without asking for anything additional, which is the usual practice in root synagogues.

Q Mr. Bryks, have you heard any of the testimony or seen any of the documents in this case or been present at any other time other than your testimony here this morning?

A No.

MR. COOPER: Thank you.

MR. MACBETH: No questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: You may come down. Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

. 1

mi

1	
•	
2	
	П
3	
	-
	-
4	
_	1
5	
	1
0	
6	1
	1
7	- 11
-	1
8	
-	
9	
10	
	- 11
11	
	1
	1
12	- 11
	II
	-
13	-
	A continue of the second of th
14	1
14	ii.
15	The second of th
13	
10	
10	
17	- 11
	1
18	
19	- 11
	- 11
00	- 11
20	- Ii
21	1
21	l
22	- 11
_	- 11
23	
	- 11

d 3E

Bryks-direct

THE COURT: At this time we will have a 15minute recess. Everyone remain seated until the
jury has left.

(Jury leaves the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Did you have something?

MR. MACBETH: No.

THE CLERK: The Court will take a 15-minute

recess.

bsb-9

(Recess.)

Farber-direct

(In open court; jury present.)

MR. GOLDMAN: Y our Honor, if we may, I spoke to Mr. Macbeth, subject to your approval. We have some gentleman on a tight schedule, Mr. Macbeth has consented to have him take the stand.

THE COURT: All right.

SHELDON FARBER called as a witness by the defense, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GOLDMAN:

Mr.Farber, can you ell us your profession and background, please.

A I am an attorney-at-law, I am licensed to practice in New York. I also have a rabbinical degree and a degree in sociology and an M.A.A. in NYU. I have lectured at Queens College and Brooklyn College.

Q Now, Mr.Farber, do you know Pabbi Elyakim Rosenblatt?

- A Yes.
- O How long have you known him?
- A Approximately 20 years.
- Q In that period of time do you know other people who know him?

SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT REPORTERS, U.S COURTHOUSE

1	A 340
2	jpb Farber 332
3	MR. GOLDMAN: Nothing further.
	MR. MACBETH: We have no further questions.
4	We would offer to stipulate that if the defend-
5	ant has any witnesses who have the same type of testimony
6	and as long as they weren't present during the trial and
7	seen any of the documents in the trial
8	MR. GOLDMAN: We have a few other witnesses
9	who might be a little more specific that might be of
10	necessity to the defendant in their testimony.
11	MR. MACBETH: This is getting cumulative, your
12	Honor.
13	
14	THE COURT: All right. We will let you put them
	on.
15	MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you, your Honor.
16	(Witness excused.)
17	MR. GOLDMAN: Dr. Feinberg.
18	RAYMOND FEINBERG, called as a witness by
19	the defense, being first duly affirmed, was examined
20	and testified as follows:
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. GOLDMAN:
23	Q Dr.Feinberg, you are a doctor?
24	
25	A Yes, I am.
	Q Can you tell us what your field is or what your

DISTRICT COURT REPORTERS, U.S. COURTHOUSE

Have you had occasion to form a personal opinion

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

upon.

jpb

Hospital.

A

A

people who know him?

with other people?

Q

Yes.

type of oractice is?

Dr. Good, would you please tell us something

and morality?

1	
1	jpb Good-direct 336
2	A Yes, I have.
3	Q Could you tell us what that opinion is?
4	A I think he is an honest man, but he has always
5	struck me as being a trifle naive.
6	Q Dr. Good, have you been present in any part of
7	this trial other than the few minutes you have been on the
8	stand?
9	A No, sir.
10	Q Have you had an opportunity to see any of the
11	documents that were introduced into ev idence in this trial?
12	A No, sir.
13	MR. COOPER: No further questions.
14	MR. MACBETH: No questions.
15	THE COURT: Thank you, you may come down.
16	(Witness excused.)
17	THE COURT: All right, you may proceed with your
18	cross-examination, Mr. Macbeth.
19	ELYAKIM G. ROSENBLATT resumed.
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. MACBETH:
22	Q Rabbi Rosenthal, you are the Dean of the Rabbinica
23	College of Queens?
24	A Yes.
25	Q Would you describe your position as the manager
THE RESERVE AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE	/ AGGGTINE AOUT DONILION SE LUG MANAGAM

	A 345
1	jpb Rosenblatt-cross 337
2	of that college?
3	A What is that?
4	Q Would you describe your position in the manage-
5	ment of that college?
6	A I lecture at the college and I am the Dean of
7	the faculty and also
8	Q I am speaking of the management of the institu-
9	tion.
10	A Yes, I try to see that the college runs and is
11	maintained.
12	Q You are in fact the manager?
13	A Yes.
14	Q What is your relationship to the Beth Jacob
15	Seminary?
16	A I am the Dean of the Beth Jacob Seminary.
17	Q What is your position in the management of the
18	Beth Jacob Seminary?
19	A I try to maintain it and see that it runs.
20	Q In fact you are the manager of the Beth Jacob
21	Seminary, is that correct?
22	A Right.
23	Q The Rabbinical College maintains a bank
24	account of its own, is that correct?

Yes.

	1	
	2	
	3	
4	1	
ţ	5	
6	6	
7	,	
8	1	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19	And the second of the second	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

jpb Rosenblatt-cross 339

have an answer to the question.

A The answer is yes.

Now, through those ten bank accounts, you have done considerable amounts of business, have you not, with the Kew Gardens branch of the Chase Manhattan Bank, the bank where Mr. Rankel is the manager?

A Yes.

You are well known to Mr. Rankel, are you not, through the extensive number of bank accounts that you keep at that bank?

MR. GOLDMAN: Objection to the "extensive number. For three different schools it is a very minute number. That is the kind of editorializing that Mr. Macbeth was objecting to.

THE COURT: There are three different schools?

MR. GOLDMAN: The rabbi testified to Beth Jacob,
the Rabbinical College and the third institution.

THE COURT: The third is what?

THE WITNESS: Is the synagogue, Grand Central Synagogue.

Q You are well known to Mr.Rankel through the bank accounts that you maintain at the bank, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Is the Rabbinical College of Queens established

The witness said on direct examination that he

jpb

Rosenblatt-cross

wished he was an accountant.

Q Based upon that conversation that you may have said you wished you were an accountant, you said nothing about consulting or checking withyour accountant, is that correct?

A That is correct.

(continued on next page.)

nd 4A

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

342

As to the source of the check, the sum and substance of what Morris Brooks told you was that the word incorporated was missing from these checks and that for that reason the people wanted to have them cashed because turning over to the Post Office would take a considerable amount of time and red tape to get them corrected, is that right?

That's right.

Q So, as to the Government's Exhibit 8 which I show you, what Mr. Brooks told you was that that check should not have been made out to Sara Dudley Brown but to Sara Dudley Brown, Incorporated?

- That's correct.
- Sara Dudley Brown, Incorporated?
- That's correct.

As to Government Exhibit 9, which I show you, made out to Gloria G. Brown, Mr. Brooks toll you that should be made out to Gloria G. Brown, Incorporated?

- That's correct. A
- You asked Mr. Brooks no further questions at that time about these checks, is that correct?
 - That's correct. A
 - Have you not told us -- strike that. Did Mr. Brooks tell you anything further that

He said he has another check and if I would be

1	jpjb Rosenblatt - cross 345
2	about that check, is that correct?
3	A I don't recall.
4	Q You no longer recall the conversation that you
5	had only cashed that check and it was deposited into the
6	rabbinical account?
7	A I mentioned he had that before already.
8	
9	and the chieffe conversation, would
10	you give me all the conversation, what further conversa- tion was there?
11	
12	ne Insisted that we take a
13	percentage this time.
14	Q What was the percentage?
	A We didn't speak about any specific sums, ever.
15	But he insisted that we accept a bigger percentage than
16	what was given last time.
17	Q How much did you in fact take?
18	A From the time before \$300.
19	Q No, this time.
20	A This time I think it was \$500.
21	Q What kind of percentage was that?
22	A I don't know exactly. It's less than 10 per cent.
23	Q Is that the total conversation you had with Mr.
24	Brooks as to that check?
25	A Well, I said that if he insists we take a

	501
1	jpjb Rosenblatt - cross 346
2	larger percentage then I would want it to be in the
3	account of the school rather than in my private account.
4	Q Any further conversation?
5	A I don't recall.
6	Q Did you have any conversation with Mr. Hardoon
7	about that check?
8	A No, I didn't.
9	Q He just gave you the envelope?
10	A Yes.
11	Q You now have Government's Exhibit 11 in front
12	of you, is that correct?
13	A That's correct.
14	Q And that is a check made out to whom?
15	A Made out to H.L. Dalis.
16	Q For how much?
17	A \$27,204.95.
18	Now, what conversation did you have with Mr.
19	Brooks in relation to that check?
20	A He called me that he had this check and I de-
21	posited.
22	Q Give me the conversation on the phone, what did
23	you say when you spoke to him on the phone?
24	A He called me that he has another check and if I
25	would be able to help him out.

- Q What did you say?
- A I said yes.
- Q Then what happened?

A So, he brought it over or he sent it over, I don't recall exactly. We went to the bank and deposited it. After three days --

- Q You say we went to the bank and deposited it?
- A Yes.
- Q What happened -- did you have any conversation at the time -- you say you sent it over and then you went to the bank together to deposit it?

A I said either he sent it over or brought it over, I don't recall exactly. Sometimes he sent it over and sometimes he brought it over. Whenever he brought it over, he went with me to make the deposit and then he would come back three days later. I would go with him to the bank and withdraw the money.

Q Now, on this occasion, you say that he went with you to the bank to deposit it?

A I don't remember exactly if he sent it over or if he brought it over. If he brought it over, he went with me to the bank.

Q Do you recall any conversation that you had with him if he went to the bank with you on that occasion?

	A 330
1	jp;jb Rosenblatt - cross 348
2	A I don't recall.
3	Q Do you remember any conversation that you had
4	with him thereafter in relation to giving him the cash
5	from the check or anything of that sort?
6	A Regarding this specific check?
7	Q That specific check.
8	A Yes.
9	Q Can you describe that conversation to the jury?
10	A When it came to three days later after the
11	check cleared and he came to me and we went to the bank,
12	we took along the checkbook or I made the check out at
13	the school, I'm not sure, but I made the check out and as
14	I was making it out, I paused and waited for him to tell
15	me how much to make it out for.
16	Q This time he said nothing, is that correct?
17	A No.
18	Q Did he tell you what to make it out for?
19	A Yes, he did.
20	Q What did he tell you to make it out for?
21	A For whichever amount is in the checkbook, 24,000
22	something.
23	Q Did you have any further conversation?
24	A I don't recall.
25	Q You gave him you then went to the bank and

gave him the cash from the check -- not the government check but the check that you had written out for \$24,200?

A I went to the bank with him. We went to Mr.

Rankel. That's what happened on every occasion, if he was present with me. We went to Mr. Rankel. Mr. Rankel said we should sit on the side there and wait. He has to gather the money. He gathered the money and then called us into the conference room in the back. He counted out the money and handed it to Morris Brooks.

Q Did you have any conversation with Morris Brooks at that time or directly after that time relevant to this transaction?

A I don't recollect.

Q That is the sum and substance of that transaction?

Do you remember anything more about it?

A As far as I remember, I don't recollect anything significant.

Q So that on this occasion that transaction with the check in the bank is the sum and substance of what happened to your recollection, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q Now, at any time in the Fall of 1974 or from early 1975, did you tell Mr. Brooks that he should not bring Mr. Hardoon -- use Mr. Hardoon in any way in

do him a favor and help him cash it. I said I would be glad to. The check was brought to me or he brought it to me and we went to the bank to deposit it. After three days, he came to me. I issued a check from the Rabbinical College of Queens to Mr. Brooks.

- Q That was a check for \$31,000?
- A \$31,000.

- Q Any further conversation of any type with Mr. Brooks in relation to this check?
 - A I don't recollect anything.
- Q You remember nothing more, that's the sum and substance of it?
 - A Yes.
- Q The depositing of the \$32,000 check and the issuing of the \$31,000 check is the sum and substance of that transaction, is that correct?
 - A That's correct.
- Q No further conversations, no further dealings in relation to that check?
 - A No.
- Q You now have Government's Exhibit 14 in front of you, is that correct?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q That is a government check?

1 jpjb Rosenblatt - cross 352 2 Yes. A 3 Who is it made out for? H. L. Dalis. 4 5 How much? 6 \$24,600. 7 Would you describe to the jury the conversation 8 that you had with Mr. Brooks in relation to that check? 9 A He called me and asked me if I can do him a 10 favor and cash the check and I agreed. We went to the 11 bank. We deposited into the bank account of the Rabbini-12 cal College of Queens. Three days later when it cleared, 13 he came to me and as I was ready to make out the check, 14 I waited for him to tell me what to make it out for. He 15 said nothing. So, I made it out to the same amount that 16 was deposited, \$24,600. 17 That is the sum and substance of that transaction? Q 18 No, it isn't. 19 Q It is not? 20 A It is not. 21 Q Would you continue with it? 22 After the check was written, he said, oh, you 23 should have made it out less because I want the college

to have something from it. So since it was made out,

already, he said let's withdraw it as it is and I'll give

24

1	jpjb	Rosenblatt - cross 353
2	you the	money in cash.
3	Q	How much money did he give you in cash?
4	A	About \$1,000.
5	Q	That's the money that you deposited in the safety
6	deposit	box?
7	A	Yes, for the charity fund.
8	Q	Of course, for the charity fund.
9		MR. GOLDMAN: Objection to that, your Honor.
10		THE COURT: Yes.
11	Q	That is the sum and substance of that trans-
12	action?	
13	A	As far as I remember.
14	Q	I show you Government Exhibit 15. Is that the
15	check th	hat you made out to Morris Brooks at that time?
16	A	Yes, it is.
17		(Continued on next page.)
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

- Q And it is from that which he gave you the thousand dollars in cash, is that correct?
 - A That's correct.
- Q And that was the part of the transaction which you just described?
 - A Yes, it is.
- Q Approximately what date did that take place; do you see the date on the check.
- A The date is May 2nd. The date on the check that we -- the check of the Rabbinical College of Queens is May 2, 1975.
- Q I show you Government's Exhibits 16 and 17, two official checks of the Chase Manhattan Bank, made out to Morris Brooks, also on May 2nd, isn't it, for \$3,000 and for \$1100, is that correct?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q Were you present during any of that transaction?
 - A I don't recall.
- Q You recall nothing about Mr. Brooks' receiving official checks on that day?
- MR. GOLDMAN: Objection, your Honor. Mr. MacBeth is implying it's a different transaction. Mr. Rankel was in there saying that he gave part cash and part in checks.

2	MR. MacBETH: I'm not implying anything, your
3	Honor. I'm asking the witness whether he remembers any-
4	thing about Mr. Brooks receiving the checks on that day.
5	MR. GCLDMAN: He said "that transaction," whic
6	was to imply that it was different than
7	MR. MacBETH: I was not implying anything.
8	THE COURT: Proceed.
9	A I'm not familiar with these checks that were
10	issued from Chase Bank.
11	Q You weren't familiar with any of the initial
12	checks that were issued?
13	A No. In the coming transaction I was familiar.
14	Q In the next transaction?
15	A Right.
16	Q What happened in the next transaction?
17	A The next transaction, the check was do you
18	have the government exhibit?
19	Q These are the last two government checks.
20	, A The next the Government Exhibit 24, check
21	made out to H.L. Dalis, \$38,500, dated July 14, 1975.
22	Again Mr. Brooks called me and asked me if we

Again, Mr. Brooks called me and asked me if we can help him, and we agreed. We deposited it in the account of the Rabbinical College, but at the last transaction Mr. Rankel at the bank asked us if we can please

- 1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that?

A The checks that were issued from Chase Manhattan Bank to Morris Brooks, I don't know anything about.

Q This is an official check to Morris Brooks for \$8500.

A Yes.

Q Look at the back of the check. Is that your signature?

A Yes, it is.

Q Do you recollect anything about that check?

A I really don't recollect anything about this, unless the fact that --

Q If you don't recollect it, don't tell us anything about it.

A Okay.

Q I show you Government's Exhibits 36, 37 and 38.

A Yes.

Q Those have been identified by Mr. Rankel as , carbon copies of the three official checks issued on the 2nd of May to Morris Brooks, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q And what is the notation on each one of them after the line that says "cash";

A Rabbi Rosenblatt.

bsjb

Rosenblatt - cross

2 Do you have any explanation how your name is on 3 there; did you see Mr. Rankel write your name on it?

A I'm not sure what this is exactly. But if it has to do --

Q Did you have any conversation with Mr. Rankel -MR. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, may the witness be
permitted to finish the answer.

THE COURT: Yes.

A All these checks are issued from Chase Manhattan Bank to Morris Broks. It could be I just endorsed it to okay Mr. Brooks' signature for him to receive cash for it, but nothing more. I have nothing to do with these checks.

Q I show you Government's Exhibits 21, 22, 23, .26, 25, 27. Have you had an opportunity to look at them?

A Yes.

Q Are they all checks, copies of checks which you signed that are payable to Morris Brooks?

A Yes, they are.

Q Are they in fact the checks that you and Mr. Brooks cashed at the Chase Manhattan Bank?

A I issued them to Mr. Morris Brooks and he cashed them, yes.

Q You went to the bank together in most instances and cashed them, is that correct?

Rosenblatt - cross

- Q And there is nothing on it saying "okay to cash," is there?
 - A No, there isn't.
- Q Does that refresh your recollection any further as to your obtaining that check?

A No. But it refreshes my recollection to the Rabbinical College check. The reason that it was triple endorsed is because that's what Mr. Rankel said we should do.

Q Let us return to the Frank P. Conley check for \$41,500, Government's Exhibit 19, which you have in front of you, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Now, starting again with that cransaction, will you describe the first conversation that you had with Mr. Brooks in r lation to that transaction?

A Mr. Morris Brooks called me up and said he has a check, if we could help him out, he could bring it over.

I said, yes. He brought it over. We went together to Chase Manhattan Bank, deposited it, three days later he came back and I took the checkbook to the bank, because Mr. Rankel wanted us to break it down, and Mr. Rankel told us exactly how to make out the three

1 bsjb Rosenblatt - cross 2 checks. 3 Q And what happened after you made out the three 4 checks? 5 After we made out the three checks, we went to the back room and to the conference room with Mr. Rankel, 6 7 and he counted out the money and handed it to Morris 8 Brooks. 9 Q He handed Morris Brooks all the money on that 10 day? 11 A All the money? No. 12 3 On the check. 13 A The money for that day. 14 What was the money for that day? Whatever the exhibit says. I don't know which 15 one that is. I think that's the one that says 17,350. 16 17 Government's Exhibit 21? Q Yes. 19 What happened after Mr. Rankel had counted out 20 the 17,350? 21 We left. A 22 He left? 23 A No. 24 Q Did you say "we left"? 25 We all left. Mr. Rankel escorted us out of the

1	bsjb Rosenblatt - cross 362
2	vault room and we left the bank.
3	What happened after you and Mr. Brooks had left
4	the bank?
5	A Well, I took him to the station, because he had
6	to go to work, so I took him with my car to the station.
7	I'm not sure, he gave us about a thousand dollars on this
8	entire transaction. I'm not sure if he gave it to us that
9	day or after after the third day.
10	Q Anything else that you remember about that day?
11	A That's as far as I recall.
12	Q So on that day you and he went to the bank, you
13	took out the checkbook
4	A Mr. Rankel told us how to make out the checks.
5	Q And you sat there and wrote it in in the check-
6	book?
7	A Right in his presence.
.8	Q And then you went into the back room
9	A No. We waited we waited until Mr. Rankel
20	. could gather the money and then we went into the conference
1	rock. He counted it out and handed the money to Morris
2	Brooks.
3	Q And you left and you drove Brooks to the station?
4	A Yes.
5	Q And that wasthe end of your business with Brooks

	× 211
1	bsjb Rosenblatt - cross 363
2	that day, is that correct?
3	A That's correct.
4	Q That was August 5th, is that correct?
5	A Yes, that's correct.
6	Q I show you Government's Exhibit 20. Can you
7	identify that?
8	A That's a check made out from Mr. Rankel, Chase
9	Manhattan Bank, to Morris Brooks for \$2,350.
10	(Continued on next page.)
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

· A

bsb-2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Rosenblatt-cross

Again, Mr. Brooks came and -- the next one was August 6. Again he came and he took the check, perhaps I went with him, I am not certain, because the check was already made out to him, and if I was with him, we went to the conference room -- the same thing.

- On August 6 you obtained how much money?
- On August 6, \$12,000.
- Did you have any further conversation with Mr. Brooks on that day?
 - I don't recollect.
 - Nothing further at all on August 6?
 - I don't remember.
 - What happened after that?

There was one more check for August 7, so apparently he came back and perhaps I went with him or he went himself, I am not certain, and cashed the last check.

- Any further discussion with Mr. Brooks that day?
- I don't recollect any.
- So that on three separate days you went with Mr. Brooks or perhaps he went alone --
 - I don't remember -- right.
- -- received the cash, gave him a check, and then some time in that period, August 5 to August 8, he presented you with a thousand dollars, is that correct?

A Right. I am not even certain -- on the first day I said I took him to the station. I am not certain.

On one of these days I probably took him to the station.

I am not sure if he was going to the station on that day, but whenever he was going and he asked me I took him.

Perhaps he went home after those occasions, I don't recollect.

Q You have Government Exhibit 24 in front of you, is that correct?

A Yes.

Q That is a Government check --

A Made out to H.L.Dalis, \$38,500, dated July 14, 1975.

Q Do you recall any discussion that you had with Mr.Brooks about that check?

A I think we mentioned before.

Q Describe the conversation you had with him, when and where it was.

A This again was the first check after Mr. Rankel had said that we should break it down. We made the deposit. When it came the time to withdraw it, we went to Mr. Rankel and he told us how to fill out the three checks.

Q What happened after he toldyou how to fill out the three checks?

11

7

9

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

b	S	b	_	4
•	3	~		

Rosenblatt-cross

A I filled it out.

Q In these cases, and I think this is the third one you have described, isn't it, Mr. Rankel on each occasion told you how much to fill out the checks for?

A That is correct.

Q Could you describe that conversation that you had with Mr.Rankel, how did it come about that he toldyou what amounts to fill the checks out in?

ment check of 26,000 -- \$24,600, Government to it, he told us that if there is to be any future reassocions, if we can please not withdraw so much money from the bank at once. So when it came the time to issue checks to.

Morris Brooks for this \$38,500 check, we went to Mr.Rankel and we asked Mr. Rankel how he would want the checks to be filled out.

day that you were in the bank and wrote out the checks
as Mr.Rankel instructed you to? I take it that would be
August 20, 1975, is that correct?

A Yes. He told us to make out the checks to -I am not sure, is this the check that goes with this one,
\$38,500? The first check was \$14,500, for that check?

Q You know the checks better than I do.

Rosenblatt-cross

A I don't. He told us to make out the three checks as he said. I don't know which goes on which.

What happened following that?

A What happened following that? The one check was good for that same day, so we went into the conference room of the bank and he counted out the money and handed it out to Morris Brooks, whatever that first check was.

0 What happened after that?

A He escorted us out of the vault room where the conference room is, and we left the bank.

O After that?

A I am not sure -- if Morris Brooks wanted to go to the station, I took him with my car. If he wanted to go elsewhere he went on his own.

Q Any conversation with Morris Brooks that day?

A I don't remember any specific conversation, but
I just mentioned already that the sum total of the three
checks, he gave us a thousand dollars in cash.

Q What happened after that?

A What do you mean, that day?

Q That day, the next day, the next time that you had any dealings with anyone relative to these checks?

A The next day the next check was due, and he probably came back and possibly I went with him, I don't

recollect, and he cashed the check. We went to the -- if I was there with him, he went to the conference room and Mr. Rankel counted out the money and handed it to him.

- Any forther conversation with him that day?
- No, not that I recollect.
- Was that the final transaction that you had in relation to these checks?

There was one more check, so he came back the next day.

Q I don't want to be too technical about this, but in fact aren't two of the checks dated August 20 and one of them August 21?

I am not sure. It could be that thes is August 19, because there is no date on here. It was just stamped by the bank. I am not sure if they stamped it the same day that we had the transaction. This must have been --

So this may well -- the first transaction may well have been on August 19 and one on August 20, one on August 21?

Possibly.

And assuming that there were three transactions rather than two, was there any further conversation at the time of the third transaction?

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

YOu simply continued to cash the checks and

THE COURT: Overruled.

nd 5B

23

24

Tk 6A

jpb-1

Rosenblatt-cross

Q And which account is that, the Rabbinical College account at the Chase Manhattan Bank in Kew Gardens?

A Yes.

Q Mr.Rosenblatt, what are the terms on which you have your ten or so bank accounts with the Chase Manhattan Bank, and by that, I mean, is there a monthly charge for the bank account and so on?

A Yes, there is.

O How much does that run to?

A I am not certain.

Q Well, as an average matter or estimate, can you tell the jury approximately what it is?

A I have no idea of the details of the office.

THE COURT: I can't hear you.

THE WITNESS: I have no idea on the details of the day-to-day workings of the office on the checkbook of the finances that is paid to the bank, I don't have any idea.

Q You are the manager of the Rabbinical College of Queens and you are the sole signatory on its bank account?

A Right, right. The secretary or the secretaries --

Q YOu have answered the question, thank you very

Rosenblatt-cross

jpb-2

much.

From y our own personal experience, how much does the bank charge on the average for a checking account?

MR. GOLDMAN: Objection, your Honor, it is irrelevant. The witness has stated he doesn't know and now he is being qualified as an expert on banking procedures.

MR. MACBETH: I am asking for his personal experience with respect to the story --

MR. GOLDMAN: Objection to the use of the word

THE COURT: Yes, sustained.

A My secretary is the one that takes care of my personal bank account too, so I don't know how it works.

- Q You don't have any idea what it costs to keep a checking account?
 - A No, I don't.
 - Or to run a checking account?
 - A No, I don't.
- Q You wouldn't know whether the bank on a check charges you a dollar to deposit the check, or cash it or whether it charges you five, ten per cent of the check?
 - A I am not familiar with that.
- Q Have you ever heard of a bank charging a thousa dollars for a check?

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

_

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

			A 000
1	jpb-4	Rosenblatt-cross	377
2	Α	Yes.	
3	Q	What is a check casher?	
4	A	Somebody who cashes a check.	
5	Q	Do you know what commercial check	cashing estab-
6	lishments a	re?	
7 .	A	Yes.	
8	Ö	They do as a regular course of bu	siness the
9	cashing of	checks, is that correct?	
10	A	Yes.	
11	Q	Do you have any familiarity with	the operation
12	of check c	ashing establishments, has anyone k	nown to
13	you ever c	ashed a check at such an establishmen	ment?
14	A	I have no familiarity.	•
15	Q	Do you have any idea what a check	cashing estab
16	lishment c	harges for the cashing of a check?	
17	A	1 h ve no idea.	
18	Q	You are total ignorant of the	way in which
19	checks are	cas ud, is that correct?	
20	, A	That is correct.	
21	Q	Your principal interest is in th	e schools and
22	synagogue	that u run, is that correct?	
23	A	That is correct.	

assure that they get the best contributions they can and

24

25

And you are interested for that reason to

in that category, I was precluded from asking. I don't

Rosenblatt-cross

jpb-6

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

an unnendo when he objected to having the facts laid out.

MR. MACBETH: I am simply going into how those funds were maintained.

THE COURT: I don't know what you mean by maintained.

MR. MACBETH: Was it an interest-bearing account.

THE COURT: It was in the safe deposit box.

MR. MACBETH: I am asking whether there was any way in which interest was earned in that safe deposit box.

MR. GOLDMAN: I will stipulate to that.

THE COURT: You can ask him that question:

A There was no interest in the safe deposit box but it was there because it had to be --

MR. MACBETH: Do not give us any further explanation.

MR. GOLDMAN: He doesn't want any further explan

tion.

THE COURT: Just a minute, gentlemen.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: We will take a recess; everybody remained seated.

(Recess.)

1	jpb-7 Rosenblatt-cross 380
2	THE COURT: Let's proceed.
3	BY MR. MACBETH:
4	Q Rabbi Rosenblatt, who was it in fact that madeu
5	the deposit tickets for these checks that went into, the
6	first one into your personal account and the others into the
7	account of the Rabbinical College of Queens?
8	A If you have a copy of them, I probably could se
9	if it is my handwriting.
10	Q I show you Government Exhibits 30 through33,
11	and Government Exhibit 43.
12	A Yes, these are my handwriting.
13	Q So thatyou were familiar with the details of
14	the checking account to the extent of making up the deposit
15	ticket?
16	A How to make the deposit ticket, yes.
17	Q Now, let's turn back for a moment to the charact
18	ter of these checks. It is your testimony that there were
19	times when Mr.Brooks went to the bank with checks which
20	, you had written to him on the Rabbinical Collage account
21	and that Mr. Brooks went by himself, and cashed those checks,
22	to the bank?
23	A I didn't testify to that.
24	Q You didn't. That every time that Brooks

cashed those checks you were with him?

A I don't recollect. I was with him most of the time

	A 389
1	jpjb Rosenblatt - cross 381
2	Q So there were some times when Brooks was alone?
3	A I don't think so. But it could be that I was
4	alone sometimes.
5	Q Now, turning your attention again to the last
6	series of checks in August that were cashed on successive
7	days, were those checks all drawn up at one time in the
8	bank or were they written out at separate times and you
9	and Brooks together came in to cash them?
10	A They were written out, the amounts were filled
11	in at the same time as Mr. Rankel told us. But they were
12	not signed until they were actually to be withdrawn.
13	Q Now, before July of 1974, did you from time to
14	time either personally or through David Hardoon send .
15	envelopes to Morris Brooks to have him mail in the
16	Post Office?
17	A Yes, I did.
18	Q How frequently did you do that?
19	A Very infrequently.
20	. Q What did you say to Mr. Brooks on those occasions
21	what did you ask him to do?
22	A Well, I knew he worked in the Post Office and
23	if he would mail it, I would mail it, it would get there
24	quicker.
25	and the second s
20	Q Just tell us a typical conversation you had with

CUB. AM

him.

A Many times I didn't have a conversation, I just brought it up to his house and had -- either sent it with Mr. Hardoon and then when I got to know Morris Brooks better -- before Morris Brooks care to me with these checks, I used to send it through Mr. Hardoon. Mr. Hardoon perhaps if you had mail that would go quicker, he knows somebody who works in the Post Office. He didn't even tell me his name in the beginning.

After we got to know Morris Brooks and David
Hardoon told me it was Morris Brooks who worked in the
Post Office, he's been the one that has been mailing the
letters for me, I dealt directly with Morris Brooks and
I just called up. If he was home, I just left it at
home with his children to mail for me the next day.

- Q That started in 1971, '72?
- A I don't recollect how much back.
- Q In that general period?
- A It was very infrequent.
- Q Infrequent or not infrequent, was that the period in 1971, '72?
 - A I'm not sure exactly how much back it was.
- Q Now, you have testified that you knew Morris

 Brooks approximately 25 years ago out of a religious high

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

school, is that correct?

Yes.

From time to time in the period before July 1974 that is the first through Mr. Eardoon or then through contact with Brooks over the phone or through his children, Brooks would take mail for you into Manhattan to be mailed?

Right.

And you of course knew that Brooks worked in Manhattan?

A Yes.

And obviously you knew he worked in the Post Office?

A Yes.

You also testified that when you met Morris Brooks in July, 1974, that it required an introduction from David Hardoon to you of Morris Brooks, is that correct?

A That's correct.

Q Now, did you ever have any conversation with Mr. Rankel in which he ever did anything beside suggesting to you the denominations of the checks that should be written out?

Not that I recall. A

You remember no further conversations in relation

24

So that it is perfectly possible that you did

25

say it, is that correct?

- A If it wasn't true, I probably didn't say it.
- Q But you don't have a specific recollection of not saying it?

A I can't say under oath that I definitely didn't say it. But I would not say it if it is not true.

Q You can't say under oath that you didn't say it, is that correct, chat's what you just testified to?

A I don't recollect speaking to anybody --

I asked you a specific question.

MR. GOLDMAN: Objection. The witness has answered it on several occasions.

THE COURT: Well, let him answer this one more time.

MR. MacBETH: Would you read the question back.

(Record read.)

Q You cannot state under oath that you did not say to someone, more than one person, after August of 1975, that you received 10 per cent of the face value of these checks?

A I don't recollect discussing it with anybody and telling anybody anything about any 10 per cent, especially if it wasn't so.

Q And can you state under oath that you did not

1

say to anyone that you had received 10 per cent of the value of these checks?

4

5

MR. GOLDMAN: Objection. Now it's been asked

6

MR. MacBETH: The witness is not answering the

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 XXX

19

21

22

23

24

25

and answered four times.

question directly, your Honor. I'm asking whether he can state that under oath. That calls for a yes or no answer. It doesn't call for his recollection but whether or not he can state under oath whether he said that.

If he doesn't recollect, his answer has to be no.

If I don't recollect, it could be yes, too, but I don't recollect.

MR. MacBETH: No further questions.

THE COURT: All right. At this time --

MR. GOLDMAN: I have one question, your Honor.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GOLDMAN:

Q Rabbi Rosenblatt, just with regard to one question Mr. MacBeth asked you.

Did you ever refer to H.L. Dalis as Dali?

Absolutely not.

Q Did you ever in Mr. Hardoon's presence refer to him as Dali or discuss it with him?

A I did not.

MR. GOLDMAN: No further questions.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. GOLDMAN: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Thank you, you may come down.

(Witness excus 1.)

THE COURT: At this time we will recess until
2:15 for lunch. The jury is excused until 2:15. Everyone in the courtroom remain seated until the jurors have
left.

(Jury excused from the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Mr. Goldman, do you have any more witnesses?

MR. GOLDMAN: We have three or four more character witnesses.

THE COURT: Does the government plan any rebuttal?

MR. MacBETH: The government may call one or two

more witnesses. We are trying to locate them at this

time. If we do have them, they will be very brief.

THE COURT: All right. Then there is a possibility that we'd sum up this afternoon, if we have just a few brief witnesses.

So, I'll tell you at this time, unless you have some motions what the court will charge and what it expects

7	p	٦	n
J	r	J	~

to your request to charge: Any motions at this time?

I'm sorry, we haven't quite finished yet.

We will recess until 2:15 and after the brief witnesses I will hear the motions and tell you what I intend to charge. But plan to sum up this afternoon.

(Luncheon recess.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

3

1

2

TlA.PM

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

XXX

XXX

^^^

12

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court, jury present.)

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Cooper, do you have another witness?

MR. COOPER: Yes. Mrs. Rosetta Buggs.

ROSETTA BUGGS, called as a witness, after being first duly affirmed, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COOPER:

Q Mrs. Buggs, could you please try and keep your voice up so that you speak to the last juror?

A Yes, sure, thank you.

Q Mrs. Buggs, how are you employed?

A I am a part time housekeeper. I was full time, but I do part time housekeeping.

Q Dc you know Rabbi Elyakim Rosenblatt?

A Yes, I do.

Q How long have you known him?

A Well, a little over 10 years.

Q How did you come to know Rabbi Rosenblatt?

A Well, my first coming to know him was he was --

		A 398
1	bsjb	Buggs - direct 390
2	I guess yo	ou call it getting a degree. I was invited to his
3	party when	n he got his degree.
4	Q	What kind of degree was that?
5	A	Well, we call it a swekah. I don't know what
6	you call :	it.
7	Q	Does that mean the time that he was ordained as
8	a rabbi?	
9	A	Yes, that's right.
10	Q	And that was about 10 years ago?
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	Have you known him since then?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	In what capacity?
15	A	He's been my spiritual leader and my dear
16	friend, go	ood friend.
17	Q	Are you a member of his congregation?
18	A	Yes, I am.
19	Q	Does your family know his family?
20	, A	Yes, my family knows his family, and my nephew
21	and he is	like two like brothers.
22	Q	You know other people who also know Rabbi Rosen-
23	blatt?	

Have you had an opportunity to discuss with

Yes, I do.

A

Q

24

these other people Rabbi Rosenblatt's reputation for honesty, veracity, truthfulness and morality?

Buggs - direct

A Yes.

Q Can you tell us what that reputation is?

A Well, his reputation to me is superb. He's one of the best.

Q Before we get to that, could you tell us what his reputation is among the people --

A It is for honesty, decent, good man, a good leader and a good everything, I would say all around everything.

Q Could you tell us now if you have a personal opinion of the traits I mentioned, and if so what that personal opinion is?

A Pardon me?

Q Could you tell us now what your own personal opinion is of the traits I mentioned as to Rabbi Rosen-blatt?

A My personal opinion is that he's superb. He's the best, he's a good leader, he's a good man -- I tell you, in my opinion, he's a good husband, he's a good father, he's a good friend and he's a good spiritual leader; there is no better.

Q Mrs. Buggs, you haven't been present for any

1	bsjb Buggs - direct 392
2	other part of this trial, have you?
3	A No.
4	Q You haven't seen any of the documents or the
5	testimony involved in it, have you?
6	A No, I haven't.
7	MR. MacBETH: No questions, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Thank you. You may come down.
9	(Witness excused.)
10	THE COURT: Is there another witness?
11	MR. GOLDMAN: Yes, your Honor.
12	Mr. Winet.
13	S. BARRY WINET, called as a witness
14	after having been first duly sworn, testified as .
15	follows:
16	DIRECT EXAMINATION
17	BY MR. GOLDMAN:
18	Q Mr. Winet, can you tell us what is your occupa-
19	tion and profession?
20	, A I am director of design for a store planning
21	firm.
22	Q Can you tell us, sir, do you know Rabbi Rosen-
23	blatt?
24	A Yes, I do.

Q How long have you known him?

xxx

XXX

DSJI

A Approximately 15 years.

Q During that 15 years have you had occasion to discuss Rabbi Rosenblatt with anybody, any other persons?

A Yes.

Q And based upon your conversations with these other persons, can you tell us what is his reputation for honesty, truthfulness and morality?

A The Rabbi is known to be of the highest caliber, the most honest person who believes in people, who is trusting, and only sees good in people.

Q Sir, have you come to form a personal opinion as to Rabbi Rosenblatt?

A I have. I have a very high regard for him as a sincere person, one who believes in people with a child? like naivete; one who can basically only see good and has a very high reputation.

Q Incidentally, Mr. Winet, have you been present during any of the testimony?

A No, I haven't.

Q Have you seen any of the documents or exhibits in this case?

A No, I haven't.

THE COURT: Questions?

MR. MacBETH: No questions.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 THE COUR : Thank you. You may come down.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Do you have another witness?

MR. GOLDMAN: Abraham Friedman.

ABRAHAM FRIEDMAN, called as a witness after being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GOLDMAN:

Mr. Friedman, do you know Rabbi Rosenblatt?

Yes.

How many years have you known him? Q

A I know Rabbi Rosenblatt three years.

Q During that time have you had occasion to discuss Rabbi Rosenblatt with other people?

Yes.

Q And based upon those discussions with other people can you tell the members of the jury what his reputation is for honestly, truthfulness and morality?

A First of all, you know, I would like to clear myself, you know, I know Rabbi three years, but I'm close to Rabbi Grossman for the last year and a half, two years, close. Why? Because I was in the school, I become a member in the school throughout my son, supposed

XXX

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to get bar mitzvah'd, and I used to belong to Young Israel of Briarwood, and you know, a Jewish boy, before 13 years old you have to be bar mitzvah's, and I tried to contact the school they should teach him the prayers, what it is, which in my life is very important.

That rabbi from Briarwood, Young Israel, you know, he promised, but he didn't fulfill the promise, after waiting a couple of months I see nothing happened. I made my wife, I says, "Well, it's a school, Grand Central Parkway, you should call up the rabbi and speak with him."

She called up, he made an appointment and I came and I spoke to him, I said, "My son will be bar mitzvah'd. I would like you should prepare. ""I'll tell you honest, I do not prepare, but I will give you someone who will do it." How much the bar mitzvah cost? He said, well, you speak to the president, you pay later.

As a Jew, and as an honest one, I will not be a witness for anybody except for the truth, if it's the truth.

After the bar mitzvah I become a member, a member up until now. He tell me to get involved, you know, I was in the Treasury Department --

You are talking about Rabbi Rosenblatt?

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Yes. A

He was the person who bar mitzvah'd your son?

Yes. I donated books. Being a treasurer, you A know, I like charity and I give charity.

Did you from time to time act as treasurer of the synogogue?

Yes, that's what I say.

By asking people, you know, when they pledge to give, I remind them, Rabbi Rosenblatt called up, he say people are old people, sick people, he say, "Don't ask them." I say, Rabbi, you feel that way, I'm a businessman, I say you are a rabbi and I respect you as a rabbi, as an honest person, you give your effort, but me as a. businessman, if somebody is pledging he has to pay. I say, if not, I resign.

And so help me God, I did.

In other words, the Rabbi told you not to ask people for money?

Right.

Q And have you found him able, in the course of your dealings with him as treasurer, have you found him able to ask people for money?

No. And -- which I'd like to clarify myself --MR. MacBETH: Your Honor, could we turn to the

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

proper character evidence?

THE COURT: Is this witness called as a character witness?

MR. GOLDMAN: As a character witness, and also specific intents with regard to possibly some of the issues or inferences developed in this trial. It's his own personal opinion and observations which may have a bearing on this case.

MR. MacBETH: Mr. Rosenblatt's dealings particularly outside the matters at issue in this trial are collateral and are not properly before the court or jury in this case.

The character evidence is perfectly proper, . and I ask Mr. Goldman to turn to that.

THE COURT: If we can conclude this with a short statement and get to the essence of this witness' testimony, which is the defendant's reputation in the community, there probably would be no objection.

BY MR. GOLDMAN:

- Q Mr. Friedman, two questions: From your observations, what is your opinion of the Rabbi as a businessman?
 - A A very bad one. He cannot run my business.
 - Q And what is your opinion of him as a person?
 - A As a person, he's a very fine r rson, a very

23

24

25

Friedman - direct

good rabbi, a very learned rabbi, and a very sincere man,

Q Incidentally, Mr. Friedman, you have not been present during any of the proceedings or heard any of the testimony?

A No.

And you have not reviewed the documents or the evidence in the case?

A No.

MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR. MacBETH: No questions.

THE COURT: Thank you. You may come down.

(Witness excused.)

(Continued on ** xt page.)

bsbr	1	Hoffman-direct			
		MR.	GOLDMAN:	Israel	Hof

ISRAEL HOFFMAN, called as a witness by the defendant, being first duly affirmed, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. GOLDMAN:

Q Mr. Hoffman, do you know Rabbi Rosenblatt?

Hoffman.

- A Yes, I do.
- Q And for how many years do you know him?
- A About 25 years.
- Q And in the period of 25 years, do you know other people who know him?
 - A Oh, yes.
- Q And have you had occasion to discuss Rabbi
 Rosenblatt with some of these other people?
 - A At numerous occas-ons.
- Q Basedd upn your conversations with these other people, can you tell the members of the jury what is this reputation for honesty, truthfulness and morality?
- A Actually, it is excellent. I never heard anything deroggatory --
- Q Mr. Hoffman, have you come to form a personal opinion with regard to Rabbi Rosenblatt?
 - A Well, I hold him as in the top rung.

mq c

5

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Hof	fman	-di	rect
-----	------	-----	------

bsbr 2

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I mean a person who is dedicated to his community and who

is always warm and interested in his friends and the 3

people he is associated with.

MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Hoffman, have you been present during any of the testimony in this case?

> No. A

Have you reviewed any of the documents or exhibits in this case?

No.

MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you very much, sir.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR. MACBETH: No questions.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Come down.

(Witness excused.)

MR. COOPER: Seymour Goldberg.

SEYMOUR GOLDBERG, called as a witness

by the defendant, being first duly affirmed,

testified as follows:

22 DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. COOPER:

Mr. Goldberg, you are an ordained rabbi?

Yes. A

23

24

1	bsbr 3 Goldberg-direct
2	Q Do you know Rabbi Elyakim Rosenblatt?
3	A Yes, I do.
4 .	Q For how long have you known him?
5	A I have known him for about 20 years,
6	since we
7	Q Keep your voice up.
8	A I have known him for 20 years since we have
9	larned together in the Rabbinical College.
10	Q As a result of knowing him for those twenty
11	years, have you had an opportunity to form a personal opinion
12	as to Rabbi Rosenblatt's honesty, morality and integrity?
13	A Yes, I have.
14	Q Could you tell us what that opinion is?
15	A Well, his honesty is boundless, and as far
16	as his I know him to be a very kind person towards other
17	people, and his kindness even extends to his judgment of
18	other people.
19	Q Can you tell us if there is anything in
20	your acquaintance with him and your observations of him that
21	leads you to that conclusion?
22	MR. MACBETH: Could we stick to the general
23	character evidence. This has become extremely cumulative.
24	He now has had 15 or 16 of these character witnesses and
25	it seems to me entirely appropriate at this point to

	402
1	bsbr 4 Goldberg-direct
2	simply remain with the witness' opinion and the opinion
3	of the community and not to bring in any more
4	MR. COOPER: I have one more question.
5	THE COURT: All right.
6	Q Tell us the basis of your opinion.
7	A The basis of my opinion, it is I see
8	Rabbi Rosenblatt as a unique individual in that he never
9	sees any evil or hears any evil about any people, and he
10	is just trusting people without ever seeing anything
11	wrong with them, even though the evidence may be the other
12	way. But he just is a trusting person. In fact,
13	I don't know his psychological makeup is such that it is
14	beyond me. He is a unique individual. I really don't .
15	get it, really.
16	Q Have you ever had any specific conversation
17	with him about that?
18	A Yes, I have.
19	MR. MACBETH: Your Honor, I would
20	THE COURT: Here we are going beyond the
21	question. You said you had one more question.
22	Now we are going into statements from the defendant.

MR. COOPER: Thank you.

24

25

THE COURT: Any cross examination?

MR. MACBETH: No cross examination.

	A
1	bsbr 5
2	THE COURT: You may come down.
3	Is there another witness?
4	MR.GOLDMAN: No, your Honor, that is the
5	defendant's case.
6	THE COURT: All right.
7	(Witness excused.)
8	(Continued on next page.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	

a pm

19 20

THE COURT: At this time we will excuse the jury for a few moments. The jurors may retire to the jury room.

(Jury leaves the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Does the government have anything further?

MR. MACBETH: The government has one rebuttal witness. I was about to jump up. I would like about three minutes with him. He arrived here at about 12 minutes past two. Perhaps we can take the requests to charge at this time. I don't think it makes any difference to that witness. We can take that at this break and not have to break with the jury again.

THE CCURT:Let us bring the jury back and finish with this witness.

Do you have the witness here?
MR. MACBETH: Yes.

(Jury present.)

having rested his case, the government now will proceed with its rebuttal case.

MR. MACBETH: The government calls Matthew Rankel, your Honor.

8 .

Rankel-direct

MATTHEW

RANKEL, called as a witness

by the government in rebuttal, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MACBETH:

Q Mr. Rankel, how many accounts are there at your branch of the Chase Manhattan Bank which Mr. Rosenblatt has some hand in the direction or control?

A I'd say about ten.

Q Now, was there ever any occasion in the course of the dealings with the checks that I questioned you about in which Mr. Rosenblatt --

THE COURT: Excuse me. Just a moment.

I see one of the jurors attempting to take notes.

JUROR NO. 1: I put it away.

THE COURT: You may take notes if you wish, but I suggest to you that we have a reporter here who is taking everything down that's being said by all the witnesses.

JUROR NO. 1: I don't think I will remember everything. I didn't think I could remember anything.

THE COURT: That's what I was getting at.

The reason we have a reporter to take down everything is when you go to the jury room to deliberate, if you would

like any of the testimony read back, we could do that.

JUFOR NO. 1: I can't recall it all in my

mind.

THE COURT: That's what I'm saying. You may take notes if you wish but it is perhaps better to listen and then, if you desire, we can have any of the testimony that you would like to hear again read back. All right.

JUROR NO. 1: Yes.

THE COURT: Let us procee i.

Mr. Rankel, yesterday you testified about a series of checks which involved Mr. Rosenblatt and Mr. Brooks, is that correct?

A Right.

O Now, do you remember any time in the course of those transactions in which Mr. Rosenblatt came into the bank and had his checkbook with him and wrote out checks out of the checkbook in front of you?

A No, I d not.

of those dealings with Mr. Rosenblatt and Mr. Brooks in which Mr. Rosenblatt came in and after a conversation with you and on your instructions wrote out three separate checks at the same time but had them dated for different days?

1	jpbr 4	Rankel-direct	407		
2	A	No, I do not remember.			
3	Q	Now, I show you Government's Exhibits 36,			
4	37, 38 and 39	. Those are carbon copies, are they no	ot, of		
5	four physical	checks of your branch of the Chase Manha	ittan		
6	Bank?				
7	A	That is right.			
8	Q	Do they have your handwriting on them?			
9	. A	They have my initial on them.			
10	Q	On each one of those, what does it say a	fter		
11	the word cas	n, Mr. Rankel?			
12	A	Rabbi Rosenblatt.			
13	Q	Now was Rabbi Rosenblatt present when t	hose		
14	official che	cks were issued?	•		
15	A	I would say yes.			
16	Q	You were present, were you not?			
17	A	Oh, yes.			
18	Q	Would you have written Rabbi Rosenblatt	if yo		
19	were not there?				
20	. A	That's my signature on there. I wrote	that		
21	on there,	res.			
22	Q	While Rabbi Rosenblatt was standing the	re?		
23	A	Right.			
24	Q	Now, I show you Government's Exhibit 18	,		
25	- 001 - 1 - 1	shock bearing your signature for \$8500 to	0		

I ask you to look at the back of that check.

Is that your initial on the back of the check?

A That is, yes.

Q The back of that check bears the endorsement of Morris Brooks and then an endorsement by Mr.Rosenblatt, is that right?

A That is right.

Q Does that mean that the funds for that check were issued to Mr. Rosenblatt?

A I would say that he received the funds for it.

It is endorsed by both of them and Rabbi Rosenblatt

got the funds, he got the money.

Now, in the course of these transactions which you have testified to, do you remember at any time asking Mr. Rosenblatt who Morris Brooks was and having Mr. Rosenblatt tell you in words or substance that Mr. Brooks worked for the Post Office?

A No, I do not.

Q Do you remember either half of that conversation, did you ever ask Mr. Rosenblatt such a question?

A No, I never asked him.

Q Did he ever volunteer such information to you?

A No, he did not.

232425

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

3

1

4

5

6

7

10

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MACBETH: I have no further questions of this witness, your Honor.

MR. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I have one or two

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. GOLDMAN:

questions.

Mr. Rankel, yesterday I believe you testified with regard to those checks, did you not, that on some occasion the bank would be short of cash to cash a check, so on occasion you would give cash and make up the balance with an official check, that was your testimony?

A That is right.

Q Mr. Rankel, am I correct that you also testified yesterday that in terms of breaking the checks down into smaller amounts that was at your instructions to
Rabbi Rosenblatt?

A Possibly --

Not the cashier's checks, with regard to

a large check breaking it down into smaller amounts

because the bank was -- it was inconvenient for the bank to

have that much cash at any one time?

- A It is possible I may have suggested that.
- Q Well, if I may have one moment.

(Pause.)

וֹל	pb	r	7
-----	----	---	---

Rankel-cross

Q Did you testify yesterday, sir, that it w	as
difficult for your bank on occasion to have large sums	ı
of cash and that you ask the checks to be broken down	
into smaller amounts?	

A There would be times when we would have a shortage of cash but I don't think I would specifically say that he should break it down into a smaller amount beforehand. I mean, I would suggest, possibly that I could order some cash and then he could come in the following day or two days later and he could give me a check for that then.

MR. GOLDMAN: I have no further questions, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. MACBETH: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, you may come down.

(Witness excused.)

THE COURT: Does the government have another rebuttal witness?

MR. MACBETH: No, the government rests.

THE COURT: All right.

We will excuse the jury at this time.

(Jury leaves the courtroom.)

THE COURT: Any motions at this time?

THE COURT REPORTERS US COURTHOUSE

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes, your Honor.

At the conclusion of all the evidence, the defense moves that the indictment against Rabbi Rosenblatt be dismissed on the following grounds, your Honor:

That while technically at the conclusion of the government's case there might have been a legal sufficiency albeit slim to survive a motion to dismiss on the basis of the lack of prima facie case, there is now at the conclusion of all the evidence, your Honor, a total lack of sufficient credible evidence upon which a jury could reasonably conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that Elyajim Rosenblatt participated in a criminal. conspiracy with Morris Brooks. I would note only quickly that the testimony of Mr. Morris Brooks is for all intents and purposes uncorroborated.

It is the testimony of a co-conspirator and I mention uncorroborated for the following reason:

It is he and he alone that testifies to any conversation with Rabbi Rosenblatt regarding tax evasion, regarding kickbacks, regarding payola, regarding the hiding of money. Not another witness corroborated that testimony and it is that testimony and only that testimony which is the heart of this case, your Honor.

it.

Morris Brooks, by his own testimony is a selfconfessed liar. A man who admits he will make up a story
for the purpose of corrupting and prevailing upon friends.
In fact, he even admits the very story regarding tax
evasion was a lie told to Rabbi Rosenblatt. That testimony has been contradicted by the government's witness and
Mr. Hardoon who claims to have been present during the
original conversation in which Morris Brooks said the
subject of tax evasion arose and the subject of hiding

the money arose came up and he says he heard nothhing of

The bank documents do not corroborate Mr. Brooks in and of themselves. The bank documents are straight—forward documents and nothing on their face evidences any irregularity as testified to yesterday by Mr. Rankel. That is the government's case. There was one suggestion made possible yesterday by Mr. Hardoon and some unidentified date in 1974 the Rabbi used the word Dali by saying I used Dali. By only Mr. Hardoon's testimony he did not know what it meant and it did not seem responsive to what he asked. He could not even testify as to what the rabbi meant. We have strictly the sole, uncorroborated testimony of a self-confessed liar and under those circumstances, your Honor, when coupled with the balance

jpbr 10

of the evidence in this case, coupled with the inability on cross examination to demonstrate that Rabbi Rosen-blatt did anything other than cash these checks, possibly naivete was his greatest sin and nothing else, and coupled with the greater amount of character testimony which the Court knows is sufficient to create reasonable doubt, that there is insufficient credible evidence upon which a jury could reasonably find beyond a reasonable doubt that Elyakim Rosenblatt 15 guilty of the crime charged.

(Con ued on next page.)

T2B.PM

75.1

1

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

THE COURT: Does the government care to respond? MR. MacBETH: Yes, your Honor ruled yesterday that the government has of course put in a prima facie case through the direct evidence which was adduced yesterday before the court and jury. But what we have had today are two types of testimony. We have had Mr. Rosenblatt's own testimony, which I submit to the court is inherently incredible. A man with ten bank accounts who contends he doesn't even know what the charges are on the bank accounts or how they operate and doesn't make out the deposit tickets. A man in order to protest his own innocence through his testimony is forced, not only to contradict Brooks, his co-conspirator who obviously is. the man with whom he has the discussions that relate directly to the substance of the conspiracy, but also to two further witnesses, Mr. Hardoon and Mr. Rankel, neither of which have any kind of animosity or reason or motive to falsify their testimony against Mr. Rosenblatt.

If anything, from the very testimony that was elicited from Mr. Hardoon, he would have an animosity against Mr. Brooks. After all, it was Mr. Brooks who involved his nephew in the theft and in the attempt to deposit and get cash in the other indictment.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 3

I submit, in fact, Mr. Hardoon's testimony is truthful and accurate and what we have from Mr. Rosenblatt today, a contradiction to that, is nothing more than a fabrication.

In addition, there have been a long, long string of character witnesses. As your Honor knows, character witnesses are not familiar with the facts of this case or the testimony that has been presented in this courtroom. They have testified again, and again, of course, as to Mr. Rosenblatt's good reputation in the community.

I only emphasize to your Honor that in fact the very crime that Mr. Rosenblatt has committed depends upon having that kind of reputation. What was Brooks' chief problem? It was getting those checks cashed. In order to do it, he had to have someone with a good reputation, someone like a banker like Mr. Rankel would not ask questions, so these checks could pass through the account with no problem.

Mr. Rosenblatt, of course, has added some other items in his testimony. There is no question now that he in fact received a very substantial amount of cash out of these arrangements. He took it in cash. He then put it into his personal safety deposit box and he certainly issued no receipts for the charitable organization which

ונפנ

he contends that money was going to.

I think that adds to the total picture of the evidence as an admission from the defendant on the stand which in fact supports and buttresses the government's case, though clearly, in a more limited way, than Brooks. I think the testimony we have had from the defense today has in no way moved an inch to overcome the government's prima facie case and has in fact tended to support that case.

THE COURT: All right. The motion made by the defendant at the end of the whole case is denied. There is more than the testimony of the government's chief witness, Mr. Brooks, here as I indicated yesterday.

There are the exhibits in evidence, consisting of the checks and other bank records which tend to corroborate his testimony. There is the testimony of David Hardoon which similarly corroborates it in many respects.

So, we are not dealing with the uncorroborated testimony of an accomplice. But, in any event, in the Federal Court, the rule is, if the jury believes beyond a reasonable doubt the uncorroborated testimony of an accomplice, that would be sufficient in and of itself for a conviction.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, the motion for a judgment of acquittal at the end of the whole case is denied.

MR. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, just for the record, may I renew the two other motions made yesterday, one with regard to there was no criminal conspiracy because of the divergent purposes of Mr. Brooks and Rabbi Rosenblatt and secondly with regard to the lack of venue in this case.

THE COURT: Yes. This court rules in the same manner that it did yesterday with respect to those two grounds for judgment of acquittal.

Now, with respect to the request to charge, taking the government's requests first. The court accepts the following, request number 1, 2, is rejected. The court of course will charge on the elements of the crime, but the court will add to these elements as set forth here.

Request No. 3 is accepted in substance.

- 4, accepted in substance.
- 5, accepted in substance.
- 6, rejected as contrary to United States against Nuccio.
 - 7, accepted in substance.
 - 8, rejected. The court will of course charge

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

on willfully and knowingly, but not this particular charge.

9, accepted in substance.

11, rejected. The court will instruct the jury that the defendant's testimony is to be judged in the same way as any other witness.

12, the court will charge on character witnesses but not includ a great deal of the language here, particularly the last paragraph or two.

13, accepted in substance.

14, rejected. The additional request, circumstantial evidence, unanimous verdict, proof and reasonable doubt, accepted.

Now, with respect to the defendant's requests: l is accepted in substance; 2 in substance, 2B in substance; 2C accepted in substance.

- 3, accepted in substance.
- 4, accepted in substance.
- 5, 6, accepted in substance, except that sentence which is followed by footnote 1 and the sentence which immediately precedes that. We discussed that yesterday, I believe.

7 is a matter we had under discussion yesterday, so that will not be accepted. There is another one.

No. 2A again, which is accepted in substance.

1 419 jpjb 2 That is, describe what an agreement is or a conspiracy 3 rather. Just to the crime of conspiracy is an agreement. That's accepted in substance. 4 5 8, character evidence is accepted. I believe those are all the requests to charge. 7 MR. COOPER: Your Honor, if I may. The 2A you 8 referred to should have been listed as a 7A but there is 9 a 2A which follows 2 which I don't believe you ruled on. 10 THE COURT: 2A, credibility of witnesses --11 MR. COOPER: Who has previously been convicted 12 of a crime. 13 THE COURT: Yes, I will accept that in substance. 14 Are there any others? 15 MR. MacBETH: Nothing further for the government. 16 MR. COOPER: No, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Under the prevailing rule, of course, 18 the government will make an opening, followed by a summa-19 tion by defense counsel with government rebutting. 20 Now, how much time do you require, Mr. MacBeth? 21 MR. MacBETH: I would estimate 20 to 25 minutes, 22 your Honor. 23 THE COURT: And Mr. Goldman?

MR. GOLDMAN: I would say something in the

neighborhood of an hour, your Honor.

24

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MacBETH: I was referring of course to my opening in chief. I would like something additional in response, particularly if we have an hour in between.

THE COURT: Suppose I suggest that at the moment each side limit itself to an hour. A trial of this case has only been two days, is it?

MR. MacBETH: That's correct.

THE COURT: Two and a half days. We started the testimony Tuesday morning, if I remember correctly. It has been a two and a half day trial. I think an hour for summations is sufficient.

We will take a five-minute recess after which we will bring in the jury and the government will commence with its summations.

(Recess.)

(In open court, jury not present.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, before we bring in the jury. with respect to the request to charge and the defendant's 7B which followed a misnumbering of 7A, you remember I indicated there was a 2A which seemed to duplicate a numbering previously.

Now, with respect to what follows 7B, that is a part of the discussion we had yesterday in this matter

about whether there is a meeting of the minds here. And so, that is rejected, to clarify the record.

All right, are we ready to proceed.

MR. MacBETH: The government is ready, your Honor.

THE COURT: Bring in the jury, please.

(Continued on next page.)

bsb

(Jury present.)

3 4

know, all of the evidence in this case is now in, and the parties on both sides have rested their case.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as you

6

7

5

As I advised you when the trial commenced, at this point the lawyers will have an opportunity to sum up.

8 9

10

11

In that connection, I want to remind you about something I told you earlier also, and that is that statements made by lawyers aren't evidence. The evidence in this case is now in and again, the evidence in this case consists of three things:

13

14

15

16

12

It consists of the testimony which you hear from the witnesses who took the witness stand right here before you, so that you could hear them and see them and observe their manner and demeanor while testifying on the witnes stand.

17 18

19

20

The evidence in this case also consists of those exhibit: which were actually received into evidence, that is, the checks and the bank records and other documents which were actally received in evidence.

The the evidence in this case consists of

21

22

23

24

any stipulations or agreements which the lawyers entered

25

into with respect to certain facts.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And you may recall when the trial commenced the Government's counsel, Mr. MacBeth, read a stipulation as to certain facts which the defense counsel agreed to.

Those three things constitute the evidence in the case.

What is going to happen now is that the lawyers are going to give you their views of what they believe the evidence shows or does not show.

In that connection I want to remind you also that it is your recollection of what a witness said which governs, what some other document shows which governs, and not the lawyers.

The lawyers, being human, like all of us, sometimes inadvertently misstate the testimony or some other part of the record. If that should occur, I want to remind you, it is your recollection which governs and not the lawyers.

Now, there is another problem which we sometimes have during summations, which I want to bring to your attention, and that is a problem which arises again from the fact that lawyers are human beings. The lawyers during the summations sometimes tend to veer into the province of the Court, that is, they try to tell the jurors what the law is or argue the law to the jurors, and then there

is an objection from opposing counsel and then there is a colloquy between the Court and the lawyers.

Well, if that should occur in this case, I want to remind you again that after the lawyers have finished with their summations the Court will instruct you as to the law applicable to this case, so you don't have to be concerned about any discussions during closing arguments or summations as to the law.

With those instructions in mind, we are about to proceed to summations, and under our system the Government, because it has the burden of proof, as I told you repeatedly now, toprove the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, the Government goes first and makes an opening summation.

Then defense counsel will have an opportunity to sum up followed by the Government's closing summation.

At this time, if the Government is ready to proceed, we will have the closing summation by the Government's counsel.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. MacBeth?

MR. MAC BETH: The Government is ready.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MAC BETH: May it please the Court, Judge Motley, Mr. Goldman, ladies and gentlemen of the jury:

As Judge Motley has told you, you have now heard the evidence on both sides of this case. It is my job to sum up that evidence to you, take you back through it, talkto you about what it means.

I want to start with something I said to you in my opening statement a couple of days of . That was that Morris Brooks isn't any kind of hero. The Government doesn't contend he was.

You have seen and heard from the witness stand what I think bears that out and makes it clear to all of you; Morris Brooks is a person who was willing to steal from the Government, made false entries in Government books. He took more than the checks involved in this case from the Government -- as you know there was another large check, and as David Hardoon said on the stand, he is a man who tells stories.

There isn't any question about that. He told a story to Mr. Hardoon about where those two checks came from, the Brown checks, saying that they were loans. He told Mr. Rosenblatt a story about them. He told him they were people who were trying to avoid their taxes, people who were getting kickbacks, getting payola.

The other thing about Mr. Brooks that I told you, the Government put him on the stand because he was

the other members of this conspiracy. He was the person with whom Mr.Rosenblatt reached the agreement to defraud the Government, and that is why the Government put him on the stand.

You can perfectly well understand from the testimony that you have heard that agreements of this sort aren't proclaimed from the housetops. It is obvious what Mr. Brooks said about the first time he goes into the bank, Mr. Rosenblatt concerts a story that, well, we will tell Mr. Rankel that you made a loan to the Rabbinical College and you are returning it.

The same thing happens again when he tells

Brooks, "Don't bring Hardoon down," Brooks of course passe
that on to Hardoon later on, and Hardoon remembers it, he
says that's right, the Rabbi said don't bring Hardoon down.

It is the kind of thing that you do keep close, you don't
make public, of course you don't, you never make that kind
of criminal conspiracy public.

The real question you have to ask yourselves, and what you have to look at, taking Mooris Brooks for what he is, is the evidence in the case, hard evidence, other witnesses, the paper, and you will see that this consistently supports Morris Brooks.

Now, let me go back and take you through some

of that. We have first, of course, Mr.Brooks obtaining the two checks from the post office. He then goes to Mr. Hardoon and he asks Mr. Hardoon to cash them. He tells him the story about a loan. Hardoon won't do it. Now it is corroborated by Hardoon. He is on the witness stand.

The difference is in the details a couple of years later about what happened, there isn't any question that that conversation took place.

Then Mr. Brooks gets in touch with Mr.

Rosenblatt, he goes down there, Hardoon takes him down,

Hardoon wasn't present during all the conversation, and

he tells Rosenblatt a different story, he tells him that

these people don't want to pay any taxes. There is

dickering. Rosenblatt agrees to take 10 per cent out of

these two checks, which total \$10,000.

Then the checks are deposited, Rosenblatt withdraws nine thousand, makes it into a cash payment and then the next check in the series, the \$700 check to Brooks.

Brooks says he gave that back to Rosenblatt.

Rosenblatt says Brooks kept it. Either way there is no
question that Rosenblatt -- and Rosenblatt admits this, that
he kept at least \$300 out of that check and maybe a
thousand dollars, no question, he kept saying.

I want to draw your attention here to an error

ded

7 8

that is in the indictment just so that you are clear about it and it doesn't confuse you, it mistakenly says in the indictment that that two checks were deposited into the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens.

From all the testimony you have .had here, it clearly isn't so, those two checks -- and I don't think this is disputed by anyone -- were in fact deposited into Mr.Rosenblatt's personal account.

What happens next?

Comes October and Brooks has in his hand the James K. Sullivan check for \$9700, Government Exhibit 10.

Again, he takes it down to Mr.Rosenblatt. This time he tells him a different story. He says Sullivan is getting kickbacks from the Government. There is no question that this is another fraudulant deal, like evading taxes, this one is beating the Government out of something else, this one is beating the Government out of a fair contract.

Rosenblatt takes the check down, deposits it, the cash comes out, and againRosenblatt himself admits that he took at least \$500 out of that one. Brooks says it was more. Brooks says it was 10 per cent.

Comes December, another check, bigger check this time, a check for \$27,204 goes into the account and

bsb

this time there is more conversation that Brooks remembers.

"Don't bring Hardoon down there, don't have him part of this," and that is corroborated by Hardoon. Hardoon remembers Brooks telling him that at about that time.

Then there is a story that is concocted to tell Mr.Rankel at the bank if he asks any questions, tell him it is a loan.

They go into the bank and put in the 07,200 check, Government Exhibit 11, and comes out a check for \$26,200. No questionabout this one. Rosenblatt's testimony on this agrees with Brooks. On that one he got \$3000, at times even more than 10 per cent.

\$3000 for cashing one check, ladies and gentle-

That check, dated September 30, went into the bank a day or two later, was the first one that was made out to H. L.Dalis.

You remember that Brooks testified that
Rosenblatt pronounced that name Dali. You also remember
that Hardoon testified that he had a conversation with
Rosenblatt at just about this time, he couldn't remember
whether it was December or January, but it was right around
there, he was worried about this whole thing, like a very

decent friend, and the same man who warned Rosenblatt about his own nephew, he goes to Rosenblatt and he asked him about Brooks and these checks and it comes out, he brings it up.

What does Rosenblatt say? It is okay, I know Daly.

It is obvious what he is referring to. He is saying that he knows the payee on that check. We know that it is false. Not evenRosenblatt contends that any more.

I can't think of a more pointed way to underline that testimony and its correctness than the fact that
Hardoon to this day doesn't understand the significance
of that, he said that right on the stand, he still doesn't
know what this thing about Dali was. It is the kind of
thing that sticks in your mind, especially, when, as
happened here, Rosenblatt cuts off the conversation after
that, the way Hardoon put it was "The case is closed."
Rosenblatt didn't want to go into it any more. But he
remembered the thing about Dali, and it didn't make sense.
It makes a lot of sense, if you realize, as you do from
the paper here, that just a day or two before, right around
that time, Rosenblatt had received a check made out to
a man whose name he pronounced as Dali, which was for,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

in that case, \$27,000 he had kept \$3000 out of.

We go on to March. This time it is a check again for Dalis, \$32,000 into the account, \$31,000 out of the account. No question about it, Mr. Rosenblatt kept at least a thousand dollars for cashing that check.

And probably he kept a lot more in cash that Brooks turned over to him.

We move on into April. This time it is another Dalis check, \$24,600. What comes out? What comes out comes out of the account, a check for Brooks for \$24,600, all the triple endorsements, the whole works, everything you have heard about, and on top of that, three official checks, all of them dated the 2nd of May, one for \$1100, one for \$3000, one for \$8500.

They are all made out to Brooks.

Rosenblatt says he doesn't remember anything about that. You heard what Mr. Rankel said this afternoon, it is not Rankel's handwriting on it. He knows Mr. Rosenblatt very well. Mr. Rosenblatt was standing there when those checks were made out.

Two of those checks, Morris Brooks testified, he deposited in a new bank account he set up.

The third one, the third one is for \$8500. What does that have on the back of it? All that it has

11 12

14

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

got ia signature of Brooks and a signature of Rosenblatt and no triple endorsement, and you heard what Mr.Rankel said again this afternoon, Rosenblatt got that money, he may have split it up afterwards or didn't take the whole 8500, but he was on the stand this morning and he said he couldn't even remember any one of those checks, and he didn't get any of the cash from any of the official checks.

Of course, after receiving cash in that case, the 2nd of May, Rosenblatt went to his personal safety deposit box and he put, by his own testimony, a thousand dollars in cash into his safety deposit box.

The next check comes out in July, Frank P. Conley, \$41,800 this time.

He takes it, Brooks takes it to Mr. Rosenblatt you remember he testified to Rosenblatt's reaction to, it's
wonderful, you have another man here. No trouble with
Dali? No, we have another one. We have Conley.

Kickbacks again. Same thing.

They take it down about the 5th of August, three checks written out, one for the 5th of August, one for the 6th of August, one for the 7th of August. They are taking so much cash out of that bank that they have to get in touch with Mr. Rankel in advance so he will have enough cash there to dole out to them, that's how big

that transaction was.

Rosenblatt said he stood there with a checkbook in front of Rankel and wrote them out as per Rankel's instructions for different days. You heard what Mr. Rankel said about that this afternoon.

What happened was that on three successive days Rosenblatt went in there, got out \$17350 one time, 12,000 on another occasion, 12,150 on a third occasion — the first time because they were short of money, the bank, Brooks had to take an official check for 2350, the fourth of those official checks, and again, Mr. Rosenblatt didn't remember anything about that official check.

They split up the proceeds again out of that great bundle of cash. And by Rosenblatt's own admission, he goes back to the safety deposit box one of those days, and he puts another thousand dollars in cash into his own safety deposit box.

In the middle of August, the last check,
the Dalis check for 38,500. Again he goes into the bank, out
come the checks in the total amount for cash, the cash is
taken out and split up, Brooks says it was split 10 per
cent and 90 per cent, the way it had always been done,
the way the whole arrangement was worked out from the
beginning.

Mr. Rosenblatt steps away from that a little bit, he says "I only got a thousand out of it," he went back to the safety deposit box, pulled out his personal safety deposit box and put in a thousand dollars cash.

Brooks gives you some reason why the numbers, the checks change. Rosenblatt wasn't a fool. He said "We can't keep doing this so it looks like there is 10 per cent coming out here, we have to change it around."

And that is exactly what they did, they changed it around.

The stories come out, you heard it from Brooks on the stand, and you have seen the whole pattern of the checks that go back and forth, that Hardoon has testified dto, Rankel has testified to, that Brooks is telling you the truth.

If he has any interest now in testifying in this court it is to tell the truth. He said that there isn't any other interest he could have.

It is not a pleasant truth, he is not a pleasant person. What he did was shocking, he betrayed an important public trust in a big way, but what he said from that witness stand supported what we see in the documents, the paper, and what you have heard from the other witnesses.

What did Mr. Rosenblatt have to offer in response

to that? Here is a man who manages three institutions, the Rabbinical College of Queens is one of them, and two other institutions where he has a public responsibility to other people, a synagogue and a seminary, and he says that he is the manager, that he is in charge of it and runs it, makes out the deposit tickets, and he says that he doesn't even know anything about what the monthly charge is at the bank, or even the vaguest idea of what it is.

He would have you believe that while he goes
down to the bank all the time with Brooks, he is willing
to go through these transactions and cash these checks,
and take his cut of the proceeds, that he is so naive about
it that despite the fact that he is the manager and runs
these things, he doesn't even know how a bank operates.

He tells you next that he knew Brooks twentyfive years ago, and he confirms here something that both
Brooks and Hardoon said, that he used to send mail over
to Brooks to have Brooks take into Manhattan to mail, so it
would get out fast.

And Brooks was kind enough to do it.

Then he goes on to tell you that in July of

1974 when all of this started he had to have David Hardoon

come down and make an introduction of Morris Brooks

to him.

Is that credible? A man who he knew for some years, who has been carrying his mail as a favor, who has talked to him on the phone, and his kids, and he has given the mail to, he has to go through the formality of an introduction when the man comes into his house again.

of course it is not a story that is confirmed in any way by David Hardoon. Then he goes on, and it is remarkable that he offers no recollection at all beyond that first strange story about the Inc. being left off the first two checks, Sara Dudley Brown, Inc., and Gloria Brown, Inc., two checks mailed to people in the area of Washington, D.C., as you will see if you look at the check, and he says the only thing that Brooks said to him was they left the "Inc." off and they can't get them deposited into the bank.

Now, use your common sense and remember, for that matter, what the manager from H.L. Dalis said yesterday. You get checks like that all the time if you are a corporation, and there is no problem putting them into the bank.

After that Rosenblatt would have you believe no questions, no explanation, no discussions, just keep going down to the bank and watch those checks roll in and keep getting the money out of the check.

Again by his own admission, he got 300 on the first two checks, 500 on the next check, 3000 on the check after that and then 1000 on each of the last three checks.

That is \$6800.

MR. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I would object.

I believe the testimony was that the sum total of the last three was a thousand dollars, not a thousand dollars on each.

THE COURT: I have instructed the jury that it is their recollection which governs and not the lawyers.

MR. MAC BETH: Ask for the cross-examination of Mr. Rosenblatt on that point.

Money just kept coming in and lots of money, more than \$6000 total cash, and never once any question, any explanation, nothing.

Does that make any kind of sense to you at all?

The picture that Mr. Rosenblatt is trying to paint here
is patently abourd. He contends that he knew nothing of
finance, that he was perfectly willing to take these checks,
which were made out to someone else, and to take cash for
his services.

There isn't any suggestion from him that

Brooks was in the habit of coming over and making thousand

dollar donations. It is clear that he gets this money every time he does a service for Brooks, every time he takes one of those checks he gets paid for it.

What does he do with the money? He tells you on cross-examination that generally contributions to the Rabbinical College are put into the bank account, but in this case he took \$3000 in cold cash andput that into his personal safety deposit box, where obviously of course it earns no interest, and it does no obvious good to the charity which he contends he is looking out for.

In order to tell you this story, and to paint his own picture of innocence, he is of course forced to call Brooks a liar, that isn't surprising, it is pretty easy to stand up and say he is a liar, and he knows that the jury knows that Brooks has pleaded guilty here to another crime, but he has to go further than that. He has got to call David Hardoon a liar and he has got to call Mathew Rankel a liar.

Think about Hardoon. He is in a difficult position, he is a friend, and has been over the years, of both Brooks and Rosenblatt. It is obvious from what he said there on the stand. It can't be a pleasure to him to have to testify here in contradiction of either one of them.

If anything, he has got more reason to testify against Brooks to put the lie to what Brooks has said.

You will remember that Brooks got his nephew in a lot of trouble, a lot of trouble. And he was angry about it. He went over there and gave Brooks a good piece of his mind.

When he came in here and testified on that stand you think back to his behavior on that stand, there wasn't any animus towards anyone, he was telling the story the way it happened.

One essential point after another he contradicts what Rosenblatt said, and he supports essentially what Brooks said.

The first conversation: He says something about an accountant. Brooks remembers that in a conversation withRosenblatt as well. Rosenblatt will have to concede that, he will say he would wish he was an accountant.

Then there is this point about who made an introduction. Hardoon said he didn't do anything like that.

Why did he have to? What Brooks did with Rosenblatt was his business. It is obvious they had known each other a long time. There was no need for introductions.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And then the point about Hardoon calling up Rosenblatt. Hardoon is very clear about that, why would he call up Rosenblatt? Rosenblatt would have you believe that Hardoon called him up and set up the whole thin ;.

The next point is the conversation he has with Brooks where he says he doesn't want any more to do with this. Brooks says, "Well, you were right, and the Rabbi told me to keep you out of it anyway."

Brooks remembers saying that to Hardoon, Brooks remembers Rosenblatt saying that to him, Hardoon remembers hearing that from Brooks, and Rosenblatt says no such conversation.

The last and important one again, and let me emphasize that, that conversaation about Dalis or Dali. It stuck in his mind. Of course it stuck in his mind. Why would he ever fabricate a story like that? The answer is he wouldn't fabricate a story like that. That is a direct statement of a conversation he had with Mr. Rosenblatt.

You can run over the thing, the same thing with Mr. Rankel. Rosenblatt was forced into the position of the story he decided to tell here, that Mr. Rankel told him to do that.

There is no question that Rankel has a good opinion of Mr. Rosenblatt, there is no reason that he would come in here and tell lies of any sort. He doesn't remembe that stuff about the checkbook and he does remember that Rosenblatt was right there when the official checks were written out; right there in Rankel's own handwriting "Cash, Rabbi Rosenblatt" on the biggest one, the \$8500 check, he looks at it and says, "Rosenblatt got the money."

(continued on next page.)

•

7 8

Now, Rosenblatt makes a lot of two points.

The first one was that all his dealings were open and above board, never would hide anything, and second, the very heavy em, asis on his reputation.

Now, think about the openness. It isn't open to take cash that you contend is due to a charity and put it into your personal safety deposit box, especially when you testify that usually in the regular course of business you put the donations and the contributions to the charity in the bank account for the charity.

Those weren't open accounts. He took the money that Brooks gave him and there was every reason to believe that it was a lot more than a thousand dollars on each of those checks, and he put it in cash on his own personal safety deposit box.

It isn't open not to send out receipts to someone that contributes to your charity, so you claim, more than \$6000 in one year.

That is a lot more than naivete. The reason you don't send out receipts to someone who has made a \$6000 contribution is that he never made any \$6000 contribution. He was splitting the proceeds of a fraudulent scheme. That is what was going on.

Then, the reputation. There is no question

jr

Mr. Rosenblatt has a good reputation. The whole scheme that is going on here depends on him having a good reputation. What was Brooks' major problem? He had to find someone to get to cash those checks, to pass them through some bank account. To do that, checks of that size, made out neither to the payee -- excuse me, made out neither the two endorsers on the back, you have to have someone who has a very good reputation. You have to have someone who can go into the bank and ask a man like Mr. Rankel, and not be asked questions. Because if you are asked questions and people start looking into it, you are caught, this isn't any answer to what you are doing.

So, of course, that is the person Brooks goes to. That very reputation is what is crucial and important to the whole scheme of fraud that you have seen laid out here before you in the last two days.

Let's look at the basic facts of this case
just against your common sense. You have got eight checks.
All of them on their face look like good Government checks.
They are for big amounts. These aren't little checks
for somebody who has got Social Security checks coming to
them or some tax refund.

They start at .4500 and they go up to over \$40,000. They are big checks. None of them is made out

CUTHERN DISTRICT COURT REPORTERS IS COURTH MINE

to Brooks. Not one. All of them Rosenblatt agrees
to cash and he keeps out of them a major share. He can't
remember whether he ever told anybody that he got 10 per
cent out of them.

But even though he can't remember that Brooks told you that he got 10 per cent out of them and he himself admits that he took more than \$6000 out of them. He takes out in cash, a large part of that cash he puts in his own safety deposit box.

Just look at those basic, very basic facts in the case. You look in the paper in the case and you see stamps on the safety deposit box ledger. The checks in various sizes and denominations going back and forth. Look for the logical explanation. The explanation of common sense.

You have got to come to the same conclusion that David Hardoon came to knowing a lot less about it than you do. It smelled. You bet it smelled. You didn't have to be very close to this to see it smelled. If you are anything like Mr. Rosenblatt was, you knew it smelled and you knew what was going on. You knew the story that Brooks was telling you, if you believed it was true, it meant that you were doing something that was illegal and fraudulent.

You were engaged and in an agreement with
Brooks to defraud the Government, to defraud it out
of contracts, to defraud it out of fair contracts, to
help people get payola and kickbacks. If you didn't
believe Brooks, you still knew it smelled. Anybody with
any common sense, anybody who runs ten bank accounts knows
it smells and anyone -- when one of his character witnesses
searches back for one event that really stands up -- what
he comes up with one night I taught school there and he
insisted on paying me, and that is the little vignette
which remains in the man's character, that kind of attention
to money, and it stands out that that time for not doing
something he got paid by Rosenblatt.

When you are that sort of man, you know a lot more than it just smells. You know that you are engaged in a fraud and you know that when Brooks brings you those checks and you go down to the bank with him, you are agreeing with him, you are going along with him, you are part of what he is doing. You are getting that money at the Government's expense illegally and improperly.

Now, you go into the jury room, you take off your jackets and really get down and looking over this evidence carefully and you should weigh it very carefully and think very carefully about what has been said.

jpb

That is an essential part of your job. The Government expects that of you, the defense expects if of you and the Court expects that of you.

When you go in there don't take off your common sense. Judge Motley has told you already, and I am sure she will tell you again, that you have to be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt of the guilt of the defendant.

Remember that, beyond a reasonable doubt. Not a whim or a caprice or some imaginary fabrications such as you heard from the witness stand today, which was a patent failure to recall events that can only have stuck very clearly in your mind.

Use you common sense. When you see and smell what was going on in this case and what you have seen from the witness stand, testimony from Brooks, corroboration of that testimony by Hardoon and by Rankel, the Government is confident that you will conclude that Mr. Rosenblatt. is guilty as charged.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. MacBeth.

Mr. Goldman.

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes, your Honor.

Judge Motley, Mr. MacBeth, Rabbi Rosenblatt,

Madam Forelady and ladies and gentlemen of the jury:

I am fully aware of the fact that the mind can only absorb what the seat can endure. I know you have been sitting since early this morning. Frankly, I know the difficult job you have had today and, of course, until I heard Mr. MacBeth sum up, I was not prepared to accuse him directly of turning off the air-conditioner as soon as the defendant went on to summation, but at this point I am prepared to attribute it to him.

I often wondered, by repeating slogans and haranguing about hidden rituals, that by the time I had gotten a chance to speak to you, you would have heard enough.

I would ask and beg that the same kind or courteous attention that you have given at the time of the trial
would extend until I discuss with you Rabbi Rosenblatt.

wants to who can use words and phrases to make it sound like the most criminal and heinous piece of business there is.

Just by way of simple example, and I will get to it later, you saw documents, you heard testimony, you heard exhibit numbers, all of which was to be evidence of the criminal and devious conspiracy in which Rabbi Rosenblatt entered.

And yet, taking each and every document, if you

jpb

recall, I asked Mr.Rankel, yesterday, is there anything in front of you that is anything other than a normal and natural banking transaction, and he said no.

Mr.Rankel also personally was aware that checks were cashed for \$180,000 and he saw nothing whatso-ever wrong with it. He told you so.

I only ask you to keep that in mind when you recall the slogans that Mr. MacBeth thows at you. Something smells. Well, if it smelled so bad, how come Mr. Rankel didn't smell it?

That is \$180,000 in cash going out of the bank.

He smelled nothing. Mr. Rankel is a businessman and he

is a banker and he is used to cash transactions.

But, in any event, let us discuss the case itself, to the extent that there is a case.

Oh, yes, there is a case. There must be a case. Why must there be a case? We are in a courtroom, we have a prosecutor, a United States attorney, a man who has committed a crime, there must be a case.

Well, that is not necessarily true. As you learned an indictment is only a charge and only brings the parties into court.

As it happens many times when you finally hear all the facts, there is no case at all.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

I am only reminded by the anecdote that someone was once asked, "If you call a tail a leg, how many legs does a dog have?" To which the person answers "Five legs."

To which the proponent of the question says, "Not at all. Even if you call a tail a leg, it isn't, a dog still c ly has four legs."

You can call this a criminal conspiracy all you want and you can call it smelly all you want, but when you look at it, it is nothing more than a man took somebody in the community on faith, he did him a favor, he cashed the checks openly and he accepted, yes, not as Mr. MacBeth said "lining his pockets," not making money, he accepted it on behalf of the Rabbinical College.

Now, Mr. MacBeth has said to you over and over again, because he knows, it is generally a suspicious circumstance if somebody is putting cash in a safety deposit box, so he plays that tune over and over. He took cash and put it in a safety deposit box and therefore, ladies and gentlemen, you know that Rabbi Rosenblatt was in a conspiracy and he is looking to defraud the Government. He forgets one thing, which I am sure none of you forgot. Rabbi Rosenthal on the stand, myself in my question tried to ask Rabbi Rosenblatt what happened to that money, what was it used for, where did it go, and guess jpb

who objected? Guess who didn't want you to hear where that money went and how it was used and demonstrate to you that it did not go into Rabbi Rosenthal's pocket and then he stands before you and says, "Oh, he put the money in the safety deposit box."

Guilty. Well, if he had any doubts and if
he was ever going to have the audacity to suggest to you
that that money was improperly used by Rabbi Rosenblatt,
all he had to do was sit still another minute and he
would have heard chapter and verse where that money went
and he didn't want to.

MR. MAC BETH: Objection, gur Honor.

MR. GOLDMAN: That was the same objection he made when he could have found out where the money went.

MR. MAC BETH: Objections and rulings on law have been clear from the Court. Objection at the time was perfectly proper and to draw this kind of inference from material which the Court has ruled on not before the jury is entirely improper.

MR. GOLDMAN: How can he sum up that the money in that box would be evidence of guilt after he objected to finding out what happened to it.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, if I may proceed.

Don't get nervous by the stack of notes. There is only

a line or two on each page and most of it is duplication.

What we have here is simply the word of Morris
Brooks.

As I will explain to you, we really only have his word. You can't bootstrap a piece here and a piece there and a thing here and say that Morris Brooks' word has been corroborated. It is the essence of this case is not the cashing of the checks. That is no crime. It is no crime to accept a portion of the proceeds of the check, either for cashing it or for donation or for any reason. That is no crime whatsoever. Whatever anybody may personally think about it, it is not a crime under our laws. The only essence of the crime here is if Morris Brooks said to Rabbi Rosenblatt, the reason I want you to cash these checks is because these people are trying to hide the money from the United States Government and will you please participate in hiding that loney.

So that the Government will be defrauded of taxes, fair contracts or any other kind of fraud whatsoever.

It is only and solely Morris Brooks that says such a conversation ever took place. All the rest, the check cashing, none of it is a crime.

I will, in abiding by the Court's admonition, not talk to you about the law, but there has to be a

criminal agreement. Not an agreement to cash checks, not an agreement to go to the bank, not even an agreement to accept money, but a criminal agreement to defraud the United States and both people have to agree to defraud the United States.

If one person is doing it innocently and the other one is a thief, then there is not the criminal agreement between the two that is necessary to convict.

Mr. MacBeth said, why do we produce Morris Brooks
here? Because conspiracies are not open and notorious.
You don't shout the conspiracies over the rooftops. You
try and hide what's going on.

So the only people we can ever get are the co-conspirators. RabbiRosenblatt stamps his school on the back of the check. Rabbi Rosenblatt signs his name on the check. Rabbi Rosenblatt goes to the bank. He talks to a man who has known him for many years. The money goes into his account. Bank statements are issued every month showing this money.

Is there anything else you can do outside of taking an ad in the New YorkTimes? Is that not really proclaiming it from the rooftops, Is that the act of a sly, devious conspirator?

He made certain there was no way that anybody

involved didn't know exactly what he was doing. The best, of cour se, is "I don't know how you hide from the Government money that the Government is paying out."

I simply do not know and I suggest that none of us can fathom it. How can you hide money when the Government is paying the money. If you pay somebody ten dollars, can it be said that whatever that person did with the ten dollars, can they hide the fact that they were paid by you the ten dollars?

The same with thekickback. The kickback
was the same going to payee. I haven't heard too much
about kickbacks in cash, but again how can you hide from the
Government when it is the Government paying it and a record
is kept of it and it is maintained. It can't be done.
I suggest to you that if the prosecution says that
Rabbi Rosenblatt was naive enough to believe that was
even possible, then you have to acquit him by virtue of
insanity and if he is that naive, he never could have the
criminal intent to defraud the Government.

Now, you heard ten per cent, ten per cent, ten per cent, ten per cent, ten per cent. It turns out it wasn't ten per cent. Why did Brooks say ten per cent? Why did he say ten per cent, because that sounds a lot better. From that Mr. MacBeth can argue who would in his right mind

wasn't ten per cent. It was more like four or five, and
sometimes less. The key thing is Rabbi Rosenblatt never

personally gained from this.

Mr. MacBeth summed up to you not on the \$18,000 that he opened on. Now he is summing up on \$6000. \$6000. Here is a man supposedly greedy, hungry, never open his mouth except to ask and demand money and yet he is willing to participate with Brooks in the obtaining of \$180,000 and all he gets it \$6000. Maybe a little extra, but that is roughly it.

If you recall, Mr. MacBeth summed up to you on \$6000.

We know from Mr. Brooks that when somebody is involved with him criminally, he splits 50-50., because when he went to Abe Hardoon and gave him a check for \$230,000 and he told Abe Hardoon the check was stolen, 50-50.

So, again, you can use slogans all you want, ten per cent. There was only one check that indicates ten per cent. After that, nothing. Again it is only the word of Morris Brooks as to these things, above \$6000 and again, I don't have to tell you how much and how far anybody -- anybody's life, anybody's reputation, anybody's

1.5

reason for being should be destroyed on the word of

Morris Brooks. If the word "despicable" didn't exist, it

would have been invented to describe that man.

Mr. MacB eth tried, tried to save something of Mr. Brooks. He said it wasn't a pleasant task for him to come here and testify. Do you remember him on the stand? He was having a ball. He was enjoying himself thoroughly. Did he look to you like a reluctant, reticent witness, the words being drawn out of his mouth, accusing another man? A man who has never in his entire life been accused of a single impropriety. Why, he was enjoying it.

what kind of human being could conceivably enjoy such a task? Only a Morris Brooks. On that and on that man's word, no human being's life can be destroyed.

There was only one time when he became reluctant and there was only one time when he became quiet and there was only one time when the words came out of his mouth slowly. That is when I asked him if he had split the money with anyone? Then he was quiet and the smile disappeared and he said no.

when I asked him if he had confederates with regard to this scheme and again, he aid no. Up until that moment, gregarious, charming, Morris Brooks, in fact he was going to con the whole jury.

i

He had been a con man all his life. He admitted it. Even as he went to the Rabbi. What story can I tell. Not what is the truth. I got to hink of a good one. Gee, I told a story to Hardoon. Maybe he didn't buy it. I better figure out something better for the Rabbi.

That is the kind of man he is. When he came to this courthouse to testify, what kind of story can I figure out that maybe the jury will accept? What kind of story can I tell that when I come up for sentencing maybe they will go easy on me. Look at the great fish I threw them. Took at the conviction I got for them. What story can I tell to make sure that happens? The Government asks you to trust him.

man on his word. The Government doesn't trust him. They put off his sentence until after this trial. They held it over his head. Why? If they trusted good old Morris Brooks to tell the truth under any circumstances, let him be sentenced in due course, let them not hold that sword over his head, but they don't trust him.

You should, you should destroy this man on his word?

I suggest to you that we would all be hung.

Now, Mr. MacBeth says, Oh, you want to see

jpb

evidence of a criminal conspiracy. Brooks and the Rabbi concocted a story to tell Mr. Rankel that this was a loan. Well, Mr. Rankel was on the stand. Did you hear Mr. MacBeth ask Mr. Rankel, did they ever say it was a loan?

Mr. Rankel never said it and better yet, Mr.

McBeth never asked him. Do you know why? Because

it never happened. And yet that was supposed to be one

of the great pieces of evidence to show that the Rabbi and

Morris Brooks got together and made up a story.

I again tried to show you that Morris Brooks had simply made a case of "which story can I tell to get past this"? The story he told in the courtroom was far and beyond different than the testimony he gave at the grand jury, especially at a time when you would think his collection was much clearer than it is now.

He admitted, maybe he didn't say it, but maybe he wasn't asked. Then I asked him, weren't you asked what conversations took place and in response to that, why, he gave us five or six different conversations here that took place. But in the grand jury, when he was asked that question, never testified. No kickbacks, no payola, none of it.

Incidentally, I do apologize for raising my voice. I know that can be disconcerting.

I tell you only because this case is a bit upsetting to me. I told you in the beginning that the privilege and the duty in this case was not one of prosecution but was one of an innocent man and a simple and modest man being wrongfully convicted on the word of a self-confessed thief.

I am refraining to admit, I am upset by it and I am upset by the possibilities of it.

From time to time my voice is raised. I apologize. I know it is rather upsetting, especially when you can't answer back.

The essence of Morris Brooks' testimony is that the Rabbi was a greedy man. The Rabbi couldn't wait to ask what are these che ks for? Every time Morris Brooks came with a check he had to ask him what is the check for.

Morris Xrooks would tell you again this one is taxes, this one is kickbacks, this one is that. As if the Rabbi couldn't wait to be assured, to make sure that he was engaging in a criminal enterprise.

He had to be assured that every time he was doing something it was criminal. Realistically, if in fact the Rabbi knew he was engaged in a criminal act, why do youhave to ask every single time? Maybe you should do

like DAvid Hardoon. Hear no evil, see no evil. But not the Rabbi. He wan to know every single time when he is doing a criminal act.

I submit to you that is inconsistent with any rationale or normal behavior.

Morris Brooks is always trying to make it better than it is because he needs it. He is coming up for sentencing and over this man's dead body, he hopes to escape the punishment he rightfully deserves.

Now, we have to keep in mind that the Government has stipulated and it is in the stipulation, the Rabbi never knew the checks were stolen. He never participated with Morris Brooks in that and never had any knowledge of it.

All now we have here is a simple check cashing situation. The only things about those checks are the conversations with Morris Brocks. As I told you, each and every story which he tells are impossible. Even the most naive person in the world could not believe it.

The Government had a record as to who was paid, how much was paid, the date on which it was paid and frankly whatever the people want to do with the money after that is their business. But the fact is the

Government knows they have the money.

MORRIS Brooks, by his own testimony, he got over \$165,000. What did he do with it? In less than a year he gambled it all away.

That is a good story, too. Because if you don't say something like that, you got to give it back.

Again, I tried to ask Morris Brooks about bank accounts possibly outside the United States and again he was forced to terminate that question by virtue of objection.

Morris Brooks had one or two alternatives. He could give the money and get some leniency or he could give up human beings, even innocent ones.

He chose to keep the money. Or, if you believe, he gambled away \$165,000, this man who was wifeless and had five children, gambled away \$165,000, the man is not even a human being.

On the word of such a man, you have been asked to destroy this man whom an entire community showed up today totell you that he is honest, he is decent, he is feeling.

people. In fact, even Mr. MacBeth said it is getting repetitious, so efforts had to be made to limit it. But

End 4

a community who has known him for 15, 20, 30 years. They told you what kind of man he is. Unselfish, doesn't know about money, is not a greedy man, says if somebody can't pay, "Don't even ask him. He is an elderly person, don't ask him."

That is the picture of the man you got from

people who know him thirty years. Are every one of them

liars? Did every one come to this court to commit perjury?

Is there any doubt in the sincerity of those people as

they told you about Rabbi Rosenblatt? Only that thief,

that despicable Morris Brooks, the only man who said

anything other than that about the Kabbi.

Would you take the word of Morris Brooks against those people?

(continued on next page.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

David Hardoon. Mr. MacBeth suggests that David 2 Hardoon was some sort of a great corroborating witness. 3 I frankly missed it if he was. The first thing David Hardoon told us was that he was present on the first con-5 versation with Rabbi Rosenblatt. In fact, he drove Morris 6 Brooks to Rabbi Rosenblatt's house and he was present. 7 And, if you recall, Morris Brooks had testified that at 8 that occasion there was negotiating and dickering for 9 10%, there was Morris telling the Rabbi this is money to 10 be hidden from the government, and David Hardoon, who I 11 frankly am not presenting to you as one of the great 12 paragons of virtue, as you will soon see, says it never 13 happened. There was no talk of 10%. There was no talk of 14

Now, David Hardoon did say one thing which Mr.

MacBeth would like to make capital of, that sometime in

December or January he smelled a rat or something and he

started to mention it to the Rabbi and the Rabbi said, "It

is okay, I know Dally. Hardoon with his Dally,

Brooks with his Dally, something to that effect. It is

too simple to suggest that Mr. Hardoon told us that at the

time this conversation took place Rabbi Rosenblatt was in

the middle of feeding a bunch of children there which is

what he said, taking care of them.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT REPORTERS, U.S. COURTHOUSE

But he could not even tell us what the word meant, that it -- he could not say what it meant. It had no meaning to him, and he doesn't even know what it meant to the Rabbi.

on the basis of that, how much can you really make of it? But the more important thing is that in December, January of 1974, there had been only one check to H. L. Dalis, one, there were two to Brown, one to a Conley, one to Dalis, so that as of that time Dalis was not a significant name particularly. So that the Rabbi should have selected one name which was not particularly significant to tell to a man who didn't know anything about it anyway, supposedly, I suggest to you that no great inference can be drawn from it.

But as far as Mr. Hardoon goes, he also told you, which I don't think he had to, but he was a Government witness and the Government is sometimes bound by their own witnesses, you can't believe a word that Morris Brooks says. All right. To that extent I will accept his testimony. He tells you so many stories you don't know what to believe.

Morris Brooks, aside from his other great traits, had given to David Hardoon, his good, close friend, a man whose wife took care of his children, a man who lived

across the street, a man who was always befriended him, he gives David Hardoon's nephew, 20 or 21-year-old key, a check for \$230,000, and David Hardoon knows nothing about it.

The boy is subsequently caught attempting to negotiate that check and he is arrested and Uncle David tells us that he did not know that that check came from Morris Brooks. Here is his 20-year-old nephew, arrested, involved with a government check, but he doesn't know the check came from Brooks, his friend, the man whose kids he is taking care of, et cetera.

difficult to believe. I would have imagined that he would have gotten it out of his nephew one way or the other.

The boy would have told him the story, if in fact it was true, or quote possibly in fact the check was given to David Hardon, and his young 20 or 21-year-old nephew was left to take the blame. Because, as you later heard,

Mr. Hardoon said that when he learned -- and that was only on the day of sentencing -- when he learned that that check was given to him by Brooks he was enraged, enraged at Brooks, and had it happened that way, rightfully so.

Here he had taken a boy who had not been in trouble, and he made him into a criminal.

David Hardoon do, by his own admission, the morning after Morris Brooks is arrested? He gets him a lawyer, and low and behold, the same lawyer that Morris Brooks had. That is rather odd. I could have understood it if he killed Morris Brooks, not really, but figuratively, I can understand if he went out of his way to bring down the wrath of the gods on him, but to get him a lawyer to defend him after what he has done to his nephew, and the same lawyer the nephew had, I suggest that Mr. Hardoon's involvement is a little more than meets the eye, and I suggest to you as you watched him testify, there was a man who was trying to hide something.

I suggest to you again, if you looked at

Morris Boorks' face when I asked him if Mr. Hardoon had
gotten money, that for the first time the smile vanished,
the charm disappeared, that Mr. Hardoon very well might
have been in an impossible position when he came into this
courtroom, and he had to -- he could not bring himself
apparently to come out and say a falsehood because he could
get caught, or something that anybody could really sink
their teeth into, because then somebody could catch him,
like if he said, "Yes, I was present and I heard talk
about tax evasion, well, maybe somebody else was there,"

maybe somehow unbeknownst to him there would be a way to refute it, so he could not say it, he could not say it. So what does he throw you? The sort of maybe to back up Brooks, he said something about Dally. He doesn't even know what it means. You know why? Because what can you say about him? It didn't happen. He didn't say it. Maybe he said something else. Maybe when he was talking to one of the children he said "Dolly," who knows what. There is no point to contradict. That is why he said it that way. Because after all, here is Mr. Hardoon also, after he is present at that first conversation, why, he is carrying envelopes back and forth, he is an errand boy. He is bringing the checks to the Rabbi, he is carrying the cash back.

I made an error yesterday, the white envelope he testified to was not \$3,000 in it, there was \$19,000 in it in hundreds and twenties. He does not know what is in it, he does not know what is in it. He thought maybe, but he does not know.

So I suggest to you, there were only three things that Mr. Hardoon told you which were acceptable, and the only reason you got the real truth is because I don't think he appreciated that they were critical. One is he lives in a community where the doing of favors and helping of

one's fellow man is an important factor and a person is looked down upon if they do not do it. He told you Morris Brooks is a liar and you can't believe a word he says, and that is about it.

The other thing he said, he was present when the critical conversation took place, and he said it never happened. So be it.

That is Mr. Hardoon, who has been brought to corroborate, to corroborate Morris Brooks.

Now, a lot has been made of the fact that the Rabbi maybe didn't ask enough questions. Well, if he had asked questions -- if he was a man who would have asked questions, he would have really found out or really thought or really understood or made sure that the whole thing was impossible.

You know, when a Rabbi asks questions, he asks a few questions, how is your wife? How is your kids? Who created the universe? After that they run out of questions. That is what this man was concerned with, not business dealings, not business transactions, not things of that nature.

You have heard people who know him all his life tell you that.

The picture created by Boorks, which you must

believe, is completely contradicted by the outpouring of people who have known him all his life, and if you believe those character witnesses as to what kind of man this is, then the story of Morris Brooks of this man saying, "I won't cash a check for you unless you pay me" -- and asking everytime what is the check about and I won't do it unless I get paid, it doesn't exist and it cannot exist.

Incidentally, I just want to point out that every time Hardoon came up with Brooks, he suddenly lost his memory. He couldn't even remember -- he said originally that he told Hardoon it was a loan, on page 105 of the transcript, he said he couldn't remember if he told Haroodn it was a loan, he couldn't remember if the discussion was in the street or the apartment, couldn't remember if they went to the Rabbi s that day or the next day, couldn't remember whether Hardoon was there or not. Every time the word Hardoon came up, Brooks couldn't give you a straight answer.

Again, I suggest to you that Mr. Hardoon's credentials may be something less than impeccable in this case.

The six per cent, the ten per cent, whatever it is, I have taled to you about. I won't belabor it.

bslk

The number went from 18,000 to 6,000 dollars, and for that 6,000 dollars, on the testimony of Morris Brooks you have been asked to convict Rabbi Rosenblatt, a man who his entire life has been without blemish, I won't may without sin, I don't think any human being is totally without sin, but I may be presumptuous in saying it, but he is as close to it as anyone I have heard from the mouths of people who know him best.

which this Government should seek the end of his professional and personal existence. He has made no criminal arrangement with Morris Brooks. He has not sought to defraud the United States Government. His sin, if there was one, was naivete. But who would really believe — Mr. MacBeth, he deals with criminals all day long, I might be skeptical, I deal with clients all day long of various nature. Many of you are in business, but who can say that a Rabbi, who his entire existence is one of faith, would believe that a man would come to him to set him up and make him a part of a criminal conspiracy?

Did he ever hurt Morris Brooks? Did he ever do anything to hurt him? Why would this man look to do this to him? Oh, Mr. MacBeth will say, oh, he didn't burt him so bad. He got \$6,000. I would like to get

bslk

hurt like that. Nonsense, nonsense.

I don't think any of you would sell your integrity or honesty for \$6,000, or \$10,000, and I don't think Rabbi Rosenblatt could or would.

He did not personally profit, as I said.

Let me see if I can be brief now. In conclusion, let me say this --

Incidentally, I have been reminded that Morris Brooks also said that the checks were made out, or that Mr. Rankel told him how to break down the checks. Again, you can check that on page 57 of the testimony, if you wish, and as far as that part goes, Mr. Rankel does not recall it being done in his presence.

You have to remember this was several years ago and to Mr. Rankel, as he told you, this was nothing but a normal transaciton. He did not tell you there was anything special about it at all.

Rabbi Rosenthal does not call Mr. Rankel a liar, by no manner or means. He may be mistaken or Mr. Rankel could be mistaken. Neither of them were taking notes when this occurred. The Rabbi knows there were three checks made out, they were opened and notoriously cashed. Mr. Rankel admits that he advised breaking the checks down because of the drain of cash.

DS

I submit to you it is a rather insignificant piece of business, and I submit to you it is the normal thing to occur after several years duration that neither party at that time treated it as particularly significant.

The Rabbi was taken in. Any of us could be taken in. The day you can't believe a sucker story is the day you are cynical beyond belief. There is always a story that can appeal to you, there is always a way that you can be taken, there is a charming con man who may come along and because you believe him, you will believe his story. It can happen to anyone.

The Rabbi accepted Morris Brooks on faith, and that was his sin. If there was a crime of accepting Morris Brooks on faith, guilty.

But he entered into no criminal conspiracy, he made no corrupt arrangement with Morris Brooks. Don't listen to the suggestion that all the documents corroborate Brooks. They are nothing but mechanical documents of money going into the bank and the checks being written. In fact, they dispute him because they, n fact, show that no ten per cent was given.

Don't listen to the safe deposit box argument because we all have the opportunity, particularly, Mr. MacBeth, to find out what happened and he didn't want

bslk

to know.

There is nothing else that I can relaly say to you. I think that everything I have said to you has been really superfluous. You have been here, the case is recent. You are certainly capable of judging the witnesses

You saw the testimony of Morris Brooks, you saw Mr. David Hardoon. You saw Rabbi Rosenblatt.

I think your common sense and good judgment can make a determination here, and I submit to you that there is no basis that this human being can be convicted beyond a reasonable doubt of a serious crime on such testimony.

I thank you very much for your kind patience and attention. I hope I have not overstayed my welcome and I now place the defendant's future in your hands.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Goldman.

Mr. HacBeth.

MR. MacBETH: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury: I first respond to Mr. Goldman's suggestion about objections I have made in the course of the trial. I have tried to keep them within bound, and I have tried to direct your attention to what matters here. What matters here is the agreement Mr. Rosenblatt made with

1

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

bslk

Mr. Broos, the fact that he took money, and how they went about doing it.

It is irrelevant whether you steal the money for charity or whether you enter into a scheme to defraud to gamble.

That is why I made those objections.

It does not matter two certs what you use the money for when you are defrauding the government to get it.

Now, Mr. Goldman in his summation really tried to do two things. One, he has tried to try Morris Brooks in this case. That is not surprising. You know the ways in which Brooks is an easy target. He has made a clean breast of what he did, he has laid it out in front of you.

But Mr. Goldman has not talked to you about some things at all, the chief one, this despicable character that he has described to you, is the spontaneous generosity he would have you believe Morris Brooks showed toward the Rabbinical College of Queens.

Somehow out of nothing but good feeling Morris
Brooks was willing to give up \$1,000 here, a \$1,000
there, \$2,000 on another occasion, just spontaneous
generosity, and there is no other explanation offered to

COLITICIAN DISTRICT COURT REPORTERS HE COURTHOUSE

that. That does not fit in one iota with the whole picture of Morris Brooks' character that Mr. Goldman has tried to paint for you.

But what does fit together in Morris Brooks' character is the story Morris Brooks told you from the stand, that Mr. Rosenblatt knew he was entering into an agreement with Brooks, they were defrauding the government and then they were splitting the proceeds. Brooks was taking ten per cent, Mr. Rosenblatt — excuse me, Mr. Brooks was taking nineteen per cent, Mr. Rosenblatt was taking ten percent. That makes sense out of everything that went on there.

There isn't some great hole in the story where suddenly Morris Brooks flips around from being somebody engaged in criminal conspiracy, and doing his best to make that work, to suddenly lavishing money on all sides.

It is that consistent story of Brooks' character that makes sense and it makes testimony that he gave, the corroborating testimony that you heard -- it corroborates what he said, the story that common sense shows happened.

Now, Mr. Goldman would have you believe that the Government says that only \$6,000 went into Mr.

Rosenblatt's pocket. I emphasize that for the obvious

bslk

reason that even Mr. Rosenblatt agrees with that. You can take even what he says, and he has got so much money out of this that it is incomprehensible, unless you believe Brooks. The evidence in fact supports Brooks all the way down the line. Brooks gives you an account of it and makes sense throughout. Rosenblatt does not do that.

You are right in finding that what you heard from the witness stand from Brooks is the truth and what you heard from the witness stand from Rosenblatt is a fabrication.

The other major line that Mr. Goldman took
in his summation was to attack David Hardoon. I invite
you there to simply go back and remember that man on the
stand. Remember the direct examination of him and the
cross-examination of him.

Ask yourself whether that man is lying. He has donated hours of unpaid labor to Mr. Rosenblatt's ventures; he has been friendly with Brooks over the years and with Brooks' kids, he does not abandon people. He is a decent man.

I do not think there was anything he said from that stand that would lead you to believe that he is anything but a decent man. He went to the Rabbi twice

when he thought things were bad, precisely because he was a decent man. He went and he told him that he thought his own nephew was ripping him off. We have had no denial of that from the stand. He went to him about this very scheme here, as he smelled something, and what happened? He was cut off with a story about Dolly.

Mr. Goldman would have you believe that there is no significance to its being Dalis or Dolly at that time. The obvious point is that the first Dalis check came in at the end of December, went into the bank, and the money came out at the beginning of January.

Hardoon remembers this happening in December or January. The obvious reference that he gets from Mr. Rosenblatt is the check that Mr. Rosenblatt has had in hands for the past three days, it is the first thing that springs to his mind, I know Dally, it is okay. If I know the payee, of course the bank will cash it, I am only negotiating it for him, everything is all right. That is why he comes up with that fabrication to Hardoon.

Hardoon remembers it probably because it is a very strange thing to say, on top of which when he is really trying to approach Mr. Rosenblatt about something that he thinks smells, Rosenblatt cuts him off. The

bslk

case was closed. That is what Hardoon said a couple of times, the case was closed, and he said that it was Rosenblatt who closed it. Rosenblatt didn't want to go into that, he didn't want to go into explanations. He gives him a quickbye. Boom. It's over. You do that because you don't want people looking into it. You want to brush it off and hope nobody remembers it.

Mr. Goldman, too, has placed a great deal of emphasis on Mr. Rosenblatt's character and background. Remember above all the facts in the case, that is what you really have to devote yourself to here. It is not whether in the past, in the last 20 or 30 years Mr. Rosenblatt has committed a crime or has acted properly; the Government is not charging him with that. He is charged with committing this crime, entering into this fraudulent agreement with Mr. Rosenblatt to which they both took a great deal of money. That is what you have to concern yourself with, did he do that? If he did, the sea of evidence from Lrooks, Rankel, Hardoon, the paper, the fabrication you got from Rosenblatt himself this morning, when you see allof that together you see that he did commit the crime, that is what counts.

That is what counts, not for the last 20 years he has been a decent upright man. The Government

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

does not challenge that. The Government is asking you to look at him. This case is about what happened to those checks from Mr. Morris Brooks.

Keep your eye right on the ball. Think about what the evidence is and that issue, the real issue in this trial. Do that seriously and carefully, and you will see Rosenblatt and Brooks came to an understanding, an agreement, not a written one, but they both knew what was going on, they knew that Brooks was getting these checks. Rosenblatt himself said that in connection with his Post Office job here in Manhattan, he was getting those checks, Rosenblatt was getting his cut, they were dealing in cash, they were dealing in checks --

MR. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I object to that. The Government has conceded that Rabbi Rosenblatt did not know anything about the obtaining of those checks. That is improper.

MR. MacBETH: I am referring to Mr. Roserblatt's own testimony that these checks were connected to the Post Office not being able to print the "i-n-c" on them

MR. GOLDMAN: It was not the Post Office, it was the Government.

MR. MacBETH: I am not suggesting that Mr.

25

Rosenblatt knew that they were stolen, but that he knew that they were connected with Brooks, and he knew Prooks was in the Post Office.

Go back over that testimony and you will see everywhere from all the witnesses, from all the evidence that it points to the agreement that Mr. Rosenblatt is charged with here. It is not written out, a conspiracy never is, but it is understood on both sides. Rosenblatt knows what he is getting his cut of the cash, yes, he gets \$1,000, or \$3,000 to cash a check. It isn't the generosity of Morris Brooks, it is because he knows it is a fraudulent deal.

He knows that he is in it with Brooks and they are ripping the Government off. That is what the evidence shows in this case.

hard, look at everything you have heard here and seen, use your common sense, put a ide anything that is outside this case, forget about trying to try Morris Brooks again, he has got his sentence coming to him, there is no question about that, and get down to the facts of this case, and when you look at the facts of this case, the Government is confident that you will find beyond any reasonable doubt that Elyakim Rosenblatt is guilty as

bslk

charged. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Mac-

Beth.

End 5

At this time we will take a recess, after which the Court will charge the jury, and after which the

jurors will begin their deliberations.

The jury is excused now for a few moments.

(Jury excused.)

THE COURT: We will take a brief recess.

(Recess.)

(continued on next page.)

Chg. 8/12/76 1 Rosenblatt 76 Cr. 142 Motley

4 T6.PM

5

7

6

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court, jury present.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, before formally beginning the charge, I want to thank you for your patience and for the careful attention which you have given to the testimony and other evidence as it has come in. I trust that you will bear with me now and give me that same degree of attention which you have given throughout the trial, so that you may carefully understand the legal principles which you are to apply to the facts in this case as you find them.

Now, before formally beginning the charge, also, I would like to thank counsel on both sides for their cooperation with the court and to congratulate each of them on the high degree of professional skill which each has demonstrated throughout the trial.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, as you approach the performance of your function in this case, that is, the determination of the guilt or innocence of this defendant, please remember that it is your duty to weigh the evidence calmly and dispassionately, without sympathy or prejudice for or against either the government of the defendant.

Now, you must bear in mind something that I believe I mentioned earlier when the trial commenced that every defendant appearing before this court is entitled

jpjb 2

^

to a fair and impartial trial, regardless of his occupation or station in life.

Now, the fact that the government is a party here and the prosecution is brought in the name of the United States of America entitles it to no greater consider than that accorded to any other party to a litigation. By the same token, it is entitled to no less consideration. That's because, as I told you initially, all parties, government and individuals alike, stand equal before the law.

Now, my function is to instruct you as to the law applicable to this case and you should accept the law as I state it to you in these instructions and apply it to the facts as you find them. The logical result of that application is a verdict in the case which must be returned by you as to the one count in this indictment. That verdict must be either guilty or not guilty.

Now, I want to caution you that you are not to single out any one instruction alone as stating the law, but you must consider these instructions as a whole. You are not to assume that I have any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of this defendant or the truth or falsity of the charge made against him. The fact that I have denied motions or granted motions in the course of the trial is

not to be taken by you as any indication that the defendant is believed by the court to be guilty or not guilty, or that the charges are true or false. My rulings on these matters, as I told you initially, had to do with questions of law and not questions of fact which you, the jury, are now about to determine. It is for the jury to determine whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty. It is not the function of the court to determine the guilt or innocence of a defendant in a jury case. But, it is the function of the court to instruct you as to the law which you are to apply to the facts in this case as you find them.

Now, if during the course of the trial a question was asked and an objection interposed and I sustained the objection, you are to disregard the question and any alleged facts contained in that question. Similarly, if I ruled that an answer be stricken from the record, you are to disregard both the question and the answer in your deliberation.

Now, the fact that I may refer to some of the testimony or some of the exhibits during the course of these instructions, does not mean that I think that that is the only evidence you should consider as the most important evidence. In deciding the guilt or innocence

of this defendant, you must consider all the testimony in this case, both direct and cross examination. You must consider all the exhibits and any stipulations as to certain facts which the lawyers have entered into.

Now, as jurors, you are the sole and exclusive judges of the facts. This means that you pass upon the weight of the evidence. It also means that you determine the credibility or the believability of the witnesses who testified here before you. It means lso that you resolve such conflicts as there may be in the evidence. Finally, it means that you draw such reasonable inferences as may be warranted by the testimony and exhibits and other evidence in the case.

Again, with respect to any matter of fact, it is your recollection and yours alone which governs. Anything that counsel for the government may have said, anything which counsel for the defendant may have said or anything which I may have said is not to be substituted by you in lieu of your own independent recollection of what the evidence is or what the evidence discloses.

Now, your verdict in this case is to be based sclely upon the evidence. Once again, the evidence in this case consists of the testimony which you heard from all of the witnesses, the stipulations as to any facts

which the lawyers may have agreed upon and the exhibits which were actually received in evidence and nothing else. Your verdict, of course, must be a unanimous verdict and must be either guilty or not guilty.

Now, as I told you you as jurors are the sole judges of the credibility of the witnesses who testified here and the weight that their testimony deserves. You know, of course, that there is no automatic way to decide who is telling the truth and who is not. Credibility may be equated with believability and reliability. If a witness is credible, you say he is believable and reliable. If he is incredible, you say he is unbelievable. There is nothing mysterious about these words.

Now, by what yardstick are you to judge the credibility of the witnesses? Each of you has given careful attention to the testimony as it came from the witnesses themselves. You observed the witnesses. Issues of fact are presented for your determination. To a large extent, the resolution of the disputed facts depend upon the credibility which you as a juror attribute to the testimony of the various witnesses and the support or lack of support each witness received from other evidence in the case.

Now, your duty is to decide the disputed issues

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

of fact. In doing so, you use your logic, your reason and your common mense. Do not be side-tracked or diverted or distracted by what you consider to be a minor or insignificant detail or irrelevance, or by what you consider to be an appeal not to your reason or logic, but to mere sentimentality or unthinking passion. I repeat, use your common sense. You should carefully scrutinize all the testimony given, both direct and cross examination. The circumstances under which each witness has testified and every matter in evidence which tends to show whether a witness is worthy of belief. Consider each witness' intelligence, motive and state of mind and demeanor and manner while on the witness stand. Consider the witness' ability to observe the matters as to which he has testified and whether he impresses you as having an accurate recollection of these matters. Consider also any relation each witness may bear to either side of the case, the manner in which each witness might be affected by the verdict and the extent to which, if at all, each witness is either supported or contradicted by other evidence in the case.

Now, inconsistencies or discrepancies in the testimony of a witness or between the testimony of different witnesses may or may not cause the jury to discredit

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

such testimony. Two or more persons witnessing an incident or a transaction may see or hear it differently. An innocent recollection like failure of recollection is not an uncommon experience. In weighing the effect of a discrepancy, always consider whether it pertains to a matter of importance or an unimportant detail and whether the discrepancy results from innocent error or intentional falsehood. In determining credibility and weight to be given to the testimony of any witness, you must give equal consideration to the testimony of the government's witnesses. The mere fact that a witness may have been employed by the government entitles him to no more and no less consideration than any other witnesss. Nor should you be influenced by the number of witnesses a side has called or the number of documents received in evidence, because it is the quality of the testimony and other evidence which counts and not the quantity. After making your own judgment, you will give the testimony of each witness such credibility, if any, as you think it deserves.

If you find that any witness, and this applies
to all witnesses who testified here, has willfully testified falsely as to any material matter, you may reject
the entire testimony of that witness or you may accept such
part or portion as commends itself to your belief or which

you find corroborated by other evidence in the case.

The law does not compel a defendant in a criminal case to take the witness stand and testify. No presumption of guilt may be raised and no inference of any kind may be drawn from the failure of a defendant to testify. However, a defendant who wishes to testify may do so and is a competent witness. The defendant's testimony is to be judged in the same way as that of any other witness.

During the course of this trial, you have heard the testimony of Morris Brooks, a person who testified concerning his own involvement in the crime charged in the indictment against this defendant. Morris Brooks is therefore, what we call an accomplice. Under the law, in order for one to be an accomplice, he must have been involved in the commission of the crime charged. He must be a participant in that crime. An accomplice does not become incompetent as a witness because of his participation in the criminal act charged. His testimony is not to be rejected unless the jury thinks it has no weight. Like any other testimony, it is to be considered and dealt with by the 12 men and women who are the triers of the facts. Such evidence is properly considered with care and scrutiny, checked up with the other facts in the case and given

7 8

appropriate weight. The testimony of an accomplice alone, if believed by you beyond a reasonable doubt, may be of sufficient weight to sustain a verdict of guilt even though it is not corroborated or supported by other evidence in the case. You should keep in mind that the testimony of an accomplice is always to be received with caution and weighed with great care.

You are instructed that in weighing the testimony of government witnesses charged as co-conspirators in this indictment, you may take into account any motive that witness may have in testifying for the government.

Again, the witness, Morris Brooks, has pleaded guilty to two charges. The charge in this indictment and another case. He has not yet been sentenced. These factors do not disqualify him as a witness, but they may well affect the weight you give his testimony in adjudging the guilt or innocence of this defendant.

Now, Morris Brooks, as a defendant in this case, has already pleaded guilty and is awaiting sentence. The fact that Morris Brooks has pleaded guilty, however, is not proof or evidence that the defendant now on trial, Elyakim Rosenblatt, is also guilty. You must remember that guilt is personal and that the guilt or innocence of the defendant now on trial must be determined by you on

the basis of the evidence adduced here at this trial, which includes, as I have said, all of the testimony and exhibits and stipulations. The guilt of one person, therefore, is never to be predicated even in art on the fact that somebody else has already pleaded guilty.

Morris Brooks has testified as a witness for the government. As I instructed you, he's also an accomplice, that is a participant in the crime charged. His testimony is therefore to be scrutinized with great care. The fact that he's an accomplice as I have previously told you, does not disgualify him as a witness.

Now, the reason you are here, as you well know, is that the defendant has entered a plea of not guilty to the charge made against him in the indictment by the grand jury. As a result, a trial jury or petit jury such as yourselves, is now called upon to determine the guilt or innocence of the defendant. Now, if the defendant is to be convicted, as I told you repeatedly, the government has the burden of proving that this defendant is guilty as charged beyond a reasonable doubt. It is a burden that never shifts. It remains upon the government throughout the entire trial. A defendant under our system does not have to prove that he is innocent. On the contrary, he is presumed to be innocent of the accusations contained in

the indictment. This presumption of innocence, as I told you, was in his favor when this trial started and continued in his favor throughout the trial. This presumption of innocence is in his favor even as I instruct you now. It remains in his favor during the course of your deliberations in the jury room. Now, this presumption of innocence is removed only if and when, after your deliberations in the jury room, you come to the conclusion that the government has sustained its burden of proof. That is to prove the defendant guilty as charged beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, the question which naturally comes up, is, what is a reasonable doubt? The words almost define themselves. Reasonable doubt is a doubt founded in reason and arising out of the evidence in thecase or the lack of evidence. It is a doubt which a reasonable person has after carefully weighing all the evidence, the kind of doubt which would make one hesitate to act. It means that doubt that is substantial and not merely shadowy. Reasonable doubt is one which appeals to your reason, your judgment, your common sense and your experiences in life. It is not caprice, whim or speculation. It is not an excuse to avoid the performance of an unpleasant duty. It is not sympathy for a defendant.

Now, if, after a fair and impartial consideration of all the evidence, you can candidly and honestly say that you are not satisfied of the guilt of this defendant and that you do not have an abiding conviction of this defendant's guilt, such a conviction as you would be willing to act upon unhesitatingly in an important and weighty matter in the personal affairs of your own life, then you have a reasonable doubt. In that circumstance, it is your duty to acquit this defendant. That is to find this defendant not guilty.

On the other hand, if after such a fair and impartial consideration of all the evidence, you can candidly and honestly say that you are satisfied of the guilt of this defendant, that you do have an abiding conviction as to this defendant's guilt, such a conviction as you would be willing to act upon unhesitatingly in an important weighty matter of the personal affairs of your own life, then you have no reasonable doubt and in that circumstance you may convict the defendant.

A reasonable doubt does not mean a positive certainty or beyond all possible doubt. It is practically impossible for a person to be absolutely and completely convinced as to any fact, any controverted fact, which by its nature, is not susceptible to mathematical certainty.

In accordance, the law in a criminal case is that it is sufficient, if the guilt of a defendant is established beyond a reasonable doubt, not beyond all possible doubt.

I want to say a word about the kind of evidence which we recognize and accept in courts of justice.

Now, on a class of evidence is called direct evidence.

The other is called circumstantial evidence.

Direct evidence is evidence which tends to show the fact in dispute without need for any other amplification. Although, of course, there is always a question whether that evidence is to be believed. Circumstantial evidence, on the other hand, tends to show other facts from which the fact in dispute may reasonably be inferred. It is that evidence which tends to prove the fact in issue by proof of other facts which have a legitimate tendency to lead the jury to infer that the facts sought to be proved were the facts sought to be proven as true. In other words, circumstantial evidence consists of facts proved from which the jury may infer by a process of recollection other facts in dispute.

(Continued on next page.)

bsjb 14

It is not necessary, for example, that the participation of a defendant be shown by direct evidence.

The defendant's connection to a crime may be inferred from such facts and circumstances in evidence, as would legimately tend to support such an inference.

Knowledge and willfulness and intent of a defendant need not be proved by direct evidence. Like any other fact in issue, it may be established by circumstantial evidence.

In every criminal case it is necessary for the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant on trial had the necessary knowledge, willfulness and intent.

Questions concerning a defendant's knowledge and willfulness and intent involve proof of a defendant's state of mind at the time of the alleged crime.

It is obviously impossible to prove directly the operation of a person's mind because you cannot look into a person's mind and see what his or her intentions are or were.

But the proof of the circumstances surrounding a defendant's activities may well supply an adequate and convincing basis for finding that a defendant acted knowingly, willfully and intentionally.

T7. PM

In other words, the actions of a defendant must be judged in their time and place, just as the full meaning of a word is commonly understood only in relation to other words in a sentence or its context.

So the meaning of a particular act or conduct may depend upon the circumstances surrounding that act or conduct on the part of a defendant.

In determining the issue of knowledge, wilfulness and intent, you are entitled to consider any statements made by the defendant which are in evidence and any acts done by the accused which are in evidence, and all other facts and circumstances in evidence, which may aid you in determining the defendant's state of mind.

You may consider such things as the defendant's age, his background, his occupation and experience, and whether such facts make it likely or unlikely, probable or improbable, that a defendant fully and precisely understood what he was doing in regard to a transaction, and where relevant in relation to others.

There has been testimony here as to the previous good character of this defendant. You should consider such evidence of reputation together with all of the other facts, and all of the other evidence in the case, in determining the guilt or innocence of the

1 2

DESCRIPT PEDORTERS US COURTHOUSE

defendant.

Evidence of a delendant's reputation as to good character, or as to those traits of character ordinarily involved in the commission of the crime charged, may give rise to a reasonable doubt since the jury may think it improbable that a person of good character in respect to these traits would comit such a crime.

But if, on all the evidence, you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty, a showing that he previously enjoyed a reputation for good character does not justify or excuse the offense, and you should not acquit him merely because you believe he is a person of good repute.

As I told you when you were being selected and before the trial commenced, an indictment is not proof or evidence. It is mere y a charge; that is, an accusation.

An indictment is a technique or method or procedure which we employ in our system whereby, as I have said, a person is accused by a grand jury of a crime or crimes and then that person is brought into court where his guilt or innocence is determined by a trial jury.

Therefore, the indictment, which I am about to read to you, has no evidentiary value, and it should not be considered

by you as proving or tending to prove anything charged therein.

As I've told you, the government has the burden of proving the charge, which is made in the indictment, beyond a reasonable doubt.

I am going to read the indictment to you and then I am going to tell you what the essential elements of the crime of conspiracy are, as charged here, that you must find that the government has established or proved beyond a reasonable doubt. And then I am go_ g to discuss those elements in greater detail.

The indictment reads as follows:

"The grand jury charges:

"From on or about July 1, 1974, and continually thereafter up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, Morris D. Brooks and Elyakim G. Rosenblatt, the defendants, unlawfully, wilfully and knowingly combined, conspired, confederated and agreed together and with each other, to defraud the United States.

"From on or about July 1, 1974 until on or about December 12, 1974, Morris D. Brooks, the defendant, was an employee of the United States Postal Service working in the accounts payable section of the Postal Service's

.

OUTHERN IN IRICT COURT REPORTERS U.S. COURTHOUSE

New York Postal Data Center.

"At all times material to this indictment, Elyakim G. Rosenblatt, the defendant, controlled the bank account of the Rabbinical College of Queens.

"Among the means by which the defendants would and did carry out the conspiracy were the following:

"From approximately in or about July 1974 to in or about July 1975, on eight separate occasions,

Morris D. Brooks, the defendant, made false entries in the accounts of the Postal Service, which entries resulted in the issuing of eight checks drawn on the Treasurer of the United States for a total of approximately \$183,509.30, all of which were recorded as payments in accounts which Morris D. Brooks, the defendant, had falsified.

"From in or about July 1974 to in or about August 1975, Morris D. Brooks, the defendant, obtained possession of the eight checks issued as a result of his having made false ertries, and he endorsed the name of the payee on each check.

"Beginning in or about July 1974 and on numerous occasions thereafter, Morris D. Brooks, the defendant, discussed the cashing of the checks with Elyakim G. Rosenblatt, the defendant, telling him that the payee didn't wish to have the checks pass through

their accounts for various nefarious reasons, including, but not limited to, attempting to evade the payment of federal taxes by the payees.

"Thereafter, pursuant to an agreement with Morris D. Brooks, the defendant, Elyakim G. Rosenblatt, the defendant, did deposit each check into the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens, and pay Morris D. Brooks, the defendant, approximately 90 percent of the face amount of each check, retaining approximately 10 percent for himself."

Now the indictment goes on to enumerate the various overt acts charged, but I am going to leave that portion of the indictment until I reach a discussion of overt acts in greater detail.

As you can see, the defendant here is charged with conspiring to defraud the United States. That's the charge. Now, conspiracy to defraud the United States is made a crime by virtue of a federal statute, and that statute is found in Title 18, United States Code, Section 371, which reads as follows:

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof, in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any

act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each is guilty of a crime."

Now, again, as you know, the defendant is presumed innocent of the charge made against him in this indictment; therefore, before you can find him guilty of the charge you must be convinced that the government has carried its burden of proof, and that is to prove that this defendant is guilty of conspiring to defraud the United States beyond a reasonable doubt.

In this connection, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt each of the essential elements of the crime charged, which are as follows:

First, the government must prove that this defendant now on trial and Morris Brooks had an agreement or understanding between themselves regarding the cashing of the eight government checks in evidence.

Second, the government must prove that the objective of the agreement or understanding was to defraud the United States.

Third, the government must prove that this defendant, who is now on trial, knowingly and wilfully entered into an agreement with Morris Brooks to defraud the United States.

Fourth, it must prove that at least one of the

overt acts alleged in the indictment, which I will read to you, was in fact committed by Morris Brooks here in Manhattan, and that that particular overt act was knowingly committed by Brooks in furtherance of the agreement, or understanding, which Brooks had with this defendant to defraud the United States.

If you find that the government has failed to prove any one of these four essential elements of the charge of conspiracy to defraud the United States, then it is your duty to acquit this defendant; that is, find him not guilty.

If, on the other hand, you find that the government has sustained its burden of proof as to each of these four elements, then you may convict this defendant; that is, you may find him guilty as charged.

Now, with respect to these four elements, there are some words which I shall define for you. The first is the word "defraud."

"Defraud" means to interfere with the lawful function of the federal government, or the lawful functions of the federal government, by deceit, craft or trickery, or by means that are dishonest.

Among the lawful functions of the federal government involved in this case are the contracts between

the government and various individuals whereby various individuals render services to the government for which government checks are issued in payment.

Another lawful function of the federal government alleged to be involved in this case is the collection of taxes due it from income earned by various individuals.

This conspiracy statute makes it a crime to interfere in any of these lawful functions by deceit, craft or trickery, or by means that are dishonest.

Consequently, anyone who knowingly agrees to participate in any scheme or manner of doing business whereby the United States government or any agency thereof is deceived or misled with respect to any of its lawful functions is guilty of a crime.

Therefore, before you can convict this defendant, Elyakim Rosenblatt, of the crime charged here, you must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that he knew that by cashing the eight checks in evide...ce for Morris Brooks the federal government would be somehow deceived, misled or duped into believing certain facts which were not really true.

You must also find that this defendant now on trial, and Morris Brooks, both understood that somehow

the federal government would be misled, deceived or duped.

The next words I wish to define for you are the words "unlawfully, wilfully and knowingly."

In order to convict a defendant on any count, or this defendant on this particular count, you must find beyond a reasonable doubt that he acted unlawfully, knowingly and wilfully.

"Unlawfully" obviously means contrary to law.

An act is done knowingly if it is done voluntarily and purposefully and not because of mistake, accident, mere negligence or any other innocent reason.

An act is done wilfully if it is done knowingly, deliberately, intentionally, and with an evil motive or purpose.

In determining whether a defendant has acted wilfully, it is not necessary for the government to establish that the defendant knew that he was breaking any particular law or any particular rule. It must, however, prove a bad purpose or motive on the part of a defendant.

Knowledge and wilfulness and intent of a defendant, as I have said before, cannot be proved by direct evidence. Like any other fact in issue, it may be established by circumstantial evidence.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT COURT REPORTERS, U.S. COURTHOUSE

What is a conspiracy? A conspiracy is a

A conspiracy presents a greater potential threat to government and society than acts committed by a lone wrongdoer.

That is why the Congress has made conspiracy to violate a federal statute or to defraud the United States a separate crime.

Concerted action for criminal purposes often, if not normally, makes possible the attainment of ends more complex than those which an individual acting alone could accomplish.

The gist of the crime of conspiracy is an agreement. And as I told you, one of the elements of this crime is that the conspirators, in this case Brooks and the defendant, agreed to perform an illegal act, and that is, to defraud the United States.

The agreement alleged in this case, as I have said, is one to defraud the United States.

The defendant is not charged with conspiring to cash checks or take a percentage of checks that may have been cashed. Those acts aren't illegal or unlawful, and one who does them, even if he agrees or conspires with another to do them, is not guilty of a crime.

It is only if you find that the defendant

agreed to defraud the United States in connection therewith that you may find this element of the crime charged to have been proved.

Continuing with the discussion of conspiracy, or the instruction regarding conspiracy:

not required to prove that two or more persons sat around a table and came to a solemn compact orally or in writing stating that they have formed a conspiracy to defraud the United States, setting forth details of the plan, the means by which the unlawful project is to be carried out, or the part to be played by each co-conspirator.

Indeed, it would be extraordinary if there were such a formal agreement or specific oral statement. Your common sense will tell you that when men in fact undertake to enter into a criminal conspiracy, much is left to unexpressed understanding.

Conspirators do not usually reduce their agreements to writing or acknowledge them before a notary public, nor do they publicly broadcast their plans.

From its very nature, a conspiracy is almost invariably secret in its origin and execution.

Therefore, it is sufficient if you find that the two defendants in this case as alleged in any

manner, through any contrivance, impliedly or tacitly, came to a common understanding to defraud the United States.

Express language or specific words aren't required to indicate assent or attachment to a conspiracy, nor is it required to find that there was any written and express agreement, as I have said.

In determining whether there has been an unlawful conspiracy or agreement as alleged here, you may judge acts and conduct of the alleged co-conspirators which are done to carry out an apparently criminal purpose.

words," is applicable here. Usually the only evidence available of a conspiracy is that of disconnected acts which, however, when taken together in connection with each other show a conspiracy to secure a particular result as certainly and conclusively as more direct proof.

Proof concerning the accomplishment of the objective of the conspiracy may be the most persuasive evidence of the existence of the conspiracy itself if you find that the venture was successful.

In determining whether the conspiracy charged in this indictment actually existed, you may consider the evidence of the acts and the conduct of the two

•

UTHERY DISTRICT COURT REPORTERS HIS COURTHOUSE

alleged conspirators as a whole, and the reasonable inferences to be drawn from such evidence.

If upon such consideration of all the evidence you find beyond a reasonable doubt that the minds of the alleged conspirators met in an understanding way, and that they agreed, as I have explained a conspiratorial agreement to you, to work together to defraud the United States, then proof of the existence of the conspiracy is complete.

While the indictment charges that the conspiracy began on or about July 1, 1974, and continued to February 10, 1976, the date on which the indictment here was filed, it is not essential that the government prove that the conspiracy started and ended on those specific dates. It is sufficient if you find that in fact a conspiracy was formed and existed for some substantial time within the period set forth in the indictment and that at least one of the overt acts was committed in furtherance of the conspiracy during that period.

An overt act, which you may find did occur, need not have occurred on a specific date, or the specific date set forth in the indictment. You need only find that it occurred no earlier than July 1, 1974, and no later than

2 February 10, 1976.

As I told you, the indictment charges that the conspiracy here had as its objective to defraud the United States, and it is essential that the government prove beyond a reasonable doubt that this was the objective of the conspiracy, the objective of the agreement between these two parties, and that is, it must prove that it was the purpose of their agreement to defraud the United States.

If you find that a conspiracy as charged did exist and that its purpose was to defraud the United States, you must, as I have said, find beyond a reasonable doubt that this defendant was a party to that agreement; that he participated in it with knowledge of its unlawful purpose, and in furtherance of its unlawful objectives.

A defendant's participation in a conspiracy, like its existence, can be inferred from such facts and circumstances in evidence as would logically sustain that inference.

I want to caution you, however, that mere association of one defendant with an alleged conspirator does not establish his participation in the conspiracy if you find that one did exist.

So, too, mere knowledge by a defendant of the conspiracy, or any illegal act on the part of an

alleged co-conspirator, is not sufficient evidence to establish the defendant's membership in the conspiracy. You must find, as I have said, actual knowing participation by this defendant in the agreement to defraud the United States.

Once you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that a conspiracy as alleged existed, and that this defendant was a member of it, any acts and declarations of any other person whom you find was also a member of the conspiracy, as alleged in the indictment, may, during its pendency, and in furtherance of its objectives, are considered the acts and declarations of this defendant even though this defendant was not present at the time, or did not know such statements were made or such acts were done in furtherance of the conspiracy.

In other words, every co-conspirator is fully responsible for what every other co-conspirator does in furtherance of the conspiracy, whether he knows about it or not, and whether he specifically approves of it or not.

Now we come to the fourth and final element which you must find if you are to find this defendant guilty of the crime of conspiring to defraud the United States.

The offense is complete only when you find

that an unlawful agreement to defraud the United States was made and any single overt act to effect the conjective of the conspiracy was thereafter committed as alleged here in the Southern District of New York, which includes Manhattan.

An overt act is any step, action or conduct which is taken to achieve, accomplish or further the objective of the conspiracy.

Now, the purpose of requiring proof of an overt act is that while parties might conspire and and agree to do an unlawful thing, they may change their minds, or even abandon the project and do nothing to carry it into effect, in which event there would be no offense or crime committed.

The government is not required to set forth in the indictment each and every act on which it relies to establish the conspiracy, or the defendant's participation therein; nor is it required to prove each overt act which may have occurred during and in furtherance of the conspiracy.

But it is required to prove that at least one overt act did take place in the Southern District of New York, which includes Manhattan.

The overt act need not be criminal in itself.

A 519

The overt act, however, must be an act which follows and tends for the accomplishment of the objective of the conspiracy, which in this case was to defraud the United States. It must be knowingly done in furtherance of that objective.

In this indictment the grand jury charges as follows:

"In pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, the following overt acts were committed in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere:

"1. In or ab it July 1974 in the Southern
District of New York defendant Morris D. Brooks made false
entries on a Postal Service Form 1951 resulting in the
issuing of a check drawn on the Treasurer of the United
States and payable to Sara Dudley Brown in the amount of
\$4,500.

"2. In or about July 1974 in the Southern
District of New York defendant Morris D. Brooks made false
entires on a Postal Service Form 1951 resulting in the
issuing of a check drawn on the Treasurer of the United
States and payable to Gloria G. Brown in the amount of
\$5,500.

"3. On or about July 15, 1975, in Queens

County, New York, defendant Elyakim G. Rosenblatt endorsed his name on the said check payable to Sara Dudley Brown and thereafter deposited the said check payable to Sara Dudley Brown into the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens.

"4. On or about July 15, 1974, in Queens
Count, New York, defendant Elyakim G. Rosenblatt endorsed
his name on the said check payable to Gloria G. Brown
and thereafter deposited the said check payable to Gloria
G. Brown into the account of the Rabbinical College of
Queens.

"5. On or about October 28, 1974, in Queens
County, New York, defendant Elyakim G. Rosneblatt
endorsed a check drawn on the Treasurer of the United States
payable to James K. Sullivan in the amount of \$9,704.35
with the stamp of the Rabbinical College of Queens and
thereafter deposited the said check payable to James K.
Sullivan into the account of the Rabbinical College of
Queens.

"6. On or about December 1, 1974, in Queens
County, New York, defendant Elyakim G. Rosenblatt endorsed
a check drawn on the Treasurer of the United States payable
to the H. L. Dalis in the amount of \$27,204.95 with the
stamp of the Rabbinical College of Queens and thereafter

deposited the said check payable to H. L. Dalis in the amount of \$27,204.95 into the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens.

"7. On or about January 6, 1975, in Queens
County, New York defendant Morris D. Brooks cashed a
check payable to him in the amount of \$24,200 drawn on
the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens and signed
by defendant Elyakim G. Rosenblatt.

"8. On or about March 18, 1975, in Queens County, New York, defendant Elyakim G. Rosenblatt endorsed a check drawn on the Treasurer of the United States payable to H. L. Dalis in the amount of \$32,000 with the stamp of the Rabbinical College of Queens and thereafter deposited the said check into the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens.

"9. On or about April 29, 1975, in Queens
County, New York, defendant Elyakim G. Rosenblatt,
endorsed a check drawn on the Treasurer of the United
States payable to H. L. Dalis in the amount of \$24,600 with
the stamp of the Rabbinical College of Queens and
thereafter deposited the said check into the account of
the Rabbinical College of Queens.

"10. In or about July, 1975, in the Southern District of New York, defendant Morris D. Brooks made false

entries on a Postal Service Form 1951 resulting in the issuing of a check drawn on the Treasurer of the United States and payable to H. L. Dalis in the amount of \$38,500.

"11. In or about July 1975 in the Southern
District of New York, defendant Morris D. Brooks made false
entries on a Postal Service Form 1951 resulting in the
issuing of a check drawn on the Treasurer of the United
States payable to Frank P. Conley in the amount of \$41,500.

"12. On or about July 31, 1975, in Queens
County, New York, defendant Elyakim G. Rosenblatt endorsed
the said check payable to Frank P. Conley in the name of
the Rabbinical College of Queens and thereafter deposited
the said check into the account of the Rabbinical College
of Queens.

"13. On or about August 6, 1975, in Queens
County, New York, defendant Morris D. Brooks negotiated
a check payable to him in the amount of \$17,350 drawn on
the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens and
signed by defendant Elyakim G. Rosenblatt, the defendant.

"14. On or about August 6, 1975, in Queens
County, New York, defendant Morris D. Brooks negotiated
a check payable to him in the amount of \$12,000 drawn on
the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens and signed
by defendant Elyakim G. Rosenblatt.

"15. On or about August 8, 1975, in Queens County, New York, defendant Morris D. Brooks negotiated a check payable to him in the amount of \$12,150 drawn on the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens and signed by defendant Elyakim G. Rosenblatt.

"16. On or about August 15, 1976, in Queens County, New York, defendant Elyakim R. Rosenblatt endorsed the said check payable to H. L. Dalis in the amount of \$38,500 in the name of the Rabbinical College of Queens and thereafter deposited the said check into the account of the Rabbinical College of Queens."

As I have told you, one of the elements of this crime which the government must prove is that an overt act committed in furtherance of the conspiracy by one of the conspirators took place in the Southern District of New York. Manhattan is in the Southern District, but Queens is not. Therefore, the government must prove that at least one act that took place -- I'll read that again. Therefore, the government must prove that at 'east one act took place in Manhattan, one of these overt acts, and that that is done in furtherance of the conspiracy.

The only testimony concerning acts that took place in Manhattan was that relating to the making of false entries and stealing of checks by Morris Brooks. You must

therefore find that one of those acts was committed in furtherance of the conspiracy.

If you find that the falsification of the Postal records by Brooks, or his stealing of checks, was in furtherance of the conspiracy, as I have defined that term, you may find that the government has proved that element of the crime charged.

If, however, you find that the commission of those acts by Brooks was not in furtherance of the conspiracy, this element will not have been proven and you must acquit the defendant.

In sum, if you find the existence of a conspiracy as alleged, that the purpose of the conspiracy was to defraud the United States, and knowing participation in that conspiracy by this defendant, you may find the defendant guilty, if you find that any overt act has been proved by the government to have occurred in the Southern District of New York, as alleged in the indictment.

If you find that the government has failed to establish beyond a reasonable doubt any one of the four elements of the crime of conspiracy which I have just enumerated and discussed in detail for you, then you must find the defendant not guilty as charged.

On the other hand, if you should find that the

government has sustained its burden of proof as to each and every one of the four elements of the crime of conspiracy as I have just enumerated and discussed for you as to this defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, then you may convict this defendant.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the most important part of this case is the part which you now as jurors are about to play, because it is for you and you alone to decide whether this defendant is guilty or not guilty as charged in the indictment.

I know you will try the issues that have been presented to you according to the oath which you have taken as jurors. In that oath you promised that you would well and truly try the issues joined in this case and a true verdict render.

I suggest to you that if you follow that oath and try the issues without combining your thinking with any emotions, you will arrive at a true and just verdict.

It must be clear to you that once you get into an emotional state and let fear or prejudice or bias or sympathy interfere with your thinking, then you will not arrive at a true and just verdict.

Now, again, your verdict must be unanimous and must be either guilty or not guilty. Your verdict must

reflect the conscientious conviction of each and every one of you.

The jury is not to consider, or in any way to speculate about the punishment which a defendant may receive if he is found guilty. The function of a jury is, as I have told you before, to determine the guilt or innocence of a defendant on the basis of the evidence and the Court's instructions as to the law.

It is then for the Court or the judge alone who has the duty of determining the sentence, if there is a conviction. So during the course of your deliberations you are not to discuss any possible punishment.

As you deliberate, ladies and gentlemen, please be careful to listen to the opinions of your fellow jurors as well as to ask for an opportunity to express your own views. No one juror holds the center stage in the jury room, and no one juror may control or monopolize the deliberations.

If, after listening to your fellow jurors, and if, after stating your own view, you become convinced that your view is wrong, don't hesitate because of stubbornness or pride of opinion to change your view.

On the other hand, do not surrender your conscientious conviction solely because of the opinion of

your fellow jurors, or because you are outnumbered.

You are instructed that you are not to reveal the standing of the jurors, that is, the split of the vote, for any verdict to anyone including the Court at any time during your deliberations.

At this time we will excuse the jury for a few moments. You may retire to the jury room.

(Jury excused)

THE COURT: At this time, gentlemen, the Court will take any exceptions you have to the charge. Does the government have any exceptions to the charge?

MR. MacBETH: No exceptions.

THE COURT: Do the defendants have any exceptions?

MR. COOPER: Very few and very brief. First we would except to the Court not giving those requests which we had made previously and which the Court previously stated it wouldnot give and those portions of the requests which the Court did not give.

Your Monor, in addition, we except to the

Court's reference to the jury's duty to determine guilt

or innocence. We believe the jurors' duty is to determine

whether the government has proved its case beyond a reasonable

doubt and they don't have to find the defendant innocent

in terms that the jurors understand that word in order to bring back a verdict of not guilty.

Your Honor, as to the Court's charge on the character evidence, the Court omitted the last paragraph of our charge which states, your Honor, "You are further instructed that the circumstances may be such that evidence of the good reputation alone and without more may create a reasonable doubt about the defendant's guilt, although without it the other evidence would convince you that he is guilty."

The Court did give a charge of character evidence, I believe that one thought should have been given and it was not.

THE COURT: What was the last part of that, although what?

MR. COOPER: "Although without it, the other evidence would convince you that he is guilty."

Finally, your Honor, the Court stated in initially explaining the four elements of the crime of conspiracy that one of Morris Brooks' acts must have been in furtherance of the agreement he had to defraud the government.

It must have been, your Honor, in furtherance also of the agreement that habbi Rosenblatt had to defraud

the government. The jury might conclude that Mr. Brooks had one agreement and Mr. Rose-- Rabbi Rosenblatt had another, or that Mr. Brooks had an agreement even though it is not alleged with somebody else to defraud the government. I believe the Court did not state the law accurately in that regard.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. COOPER: No.

THE COURT: All right. Let's bring in the jury.

(Jury present)

THE COURT: All right. At this time I will ask the clerk to swear the marshals.

(One marshal was sworn by the clerk)

THE COURT: One of the jurors asked whether he would have an opportunity to make a phone call. If you will give the number and message to the marshal, he'll make the call for you.

If you have any questions you want to ask the Court, there will be paper and pencil furnished you in the jury room, and you write out whatever it is you want to know.

All right. You may follow the marshal to the jury room.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

(Whereupon at 6:30 p.m. the jury retired to commence deliberations)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, the jurors will be going out to dinner at 7 o'clock. I will find out where they are going so you can avoid that place. The jurors will be going to Aldo's, so please avoid that restaurant.

We will recess.

(Recess)

(Time noted: 9:00 p.m.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, we have a note from the jurors which reads as follows:

"We would like to see all documents for evidence (these checks included. All exhibits)."

MR. MacBETH: There is only one problem, your Honor, I have been unable to locate the original of one of the ledger sheets. I would suggest substituting a Xerox copy that I have. I looked for it among the items I picked up yesterday, and I asked Mr. Goldman about it in the middle of the day today.

Apart from that one ledger sheet, which I do have a Xerox copy of, I believe that between us we have all the exhibits.

MR. GOLDMAN: I have no objection.

	., .
1	bsas43 A 531
	THE COURT: Pardon me?
3	MR. GOLDMAN: I have no objection to substitut-
4	ing a copy.
5	THE COURT: All right. What is the exhibit
6	number?
7	(Court's Exhibit A marked)
8	MR. MacBETH: It's Court's Exhibit 29.
9	THE COURT: You are substituting a photocopy,
10	is that it?
11	MR. MacBETH: Yes.
12	THE COURT: The defendants had only one exhibit,
13	is that it, Exhibit A.
14	The government's exhibits were Exhibit 8 through
15	44, is that it?
16	MR. MacBETH: I believe that is correct, your
17	Honor. I have all of them from 8 through 44, including 24.
18	(Government's Exhibit 29 marked in evidence,
19	substituted.)
20	THE COURT: Would you give those to the marshal
21	to give to the jurors.
22	(Recess)
23	(Time noted: 9:30 p.m.)
24	THE COURT: We have a new note from the jurors
CANDED DOOR NOT SHOULD BE	

which reads as follows:

"In the Judge's charge to the jury there were four conditions. We would like the definitions of these conditions to determine a verdict."

Then they have enclosed Exhibit 18, the first word I cannot make out, something of Exhibit Number 18 enclosed.

Do you want to look at it, Mr. MacBeth and Mr. Goldman, and see if you can make out the first word, second sentence?

MR. COOPER: Verification.

MR. GOLDMAN: That's the cashier's check.

THE COURT: Can anybody make out the first word of that second sentence?

MR. MacBETH: I think the only thing to do is ask, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have the jurors come in. We will have the forelady read it.

(Time noted: 10:25 p.m. Jury enters courtroom.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we have a second note from you, which has been marked Court's Exhibit B, and I will ask the foreman to read that. Are you able to read that? Is that your handwriting?

THE FORELADY: Yes. The jury has asked me to

make this note for reclarification in the Judge's charge to the jury there were four conditions. They would like the definitions of these conditions to determine a verdict.

THE COURT: What is the next sentence?

THE FORELADY: Clarification of Exhibit
Number 18, which was enclosed. That was the check for \$8500.

THE COURT: You mean you want testimony regarding that particular exhibit reread?

THE FORELADY: That is correct.

THE COURT: First I'll reread to you the four essential elements of the crime of conspiracy and then the reporter will have to look for the testimony regarding that particular exhibit.

I will therefore reread those four conditions.

First the government must prove that this defendant now on trial, and Morris Brooks, had an agreement or understanding between themselves regarding the cashing of the eight government checks in evidence.

Second, the government must prove that the objective of the agreement or understanding was to defraud the United States.

Third, the government must prove that this defendant, who is now on trial, knowingly and wilfully

2

3

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

entered into an agreement with Morris Brooks to defraud the United States.

Fourth, it must prove that at least one of the overt acts alleged in the indictment was in fact committed by Morris Brooks here in Manhattan, and that that particular overt act was knowingly committed by Brooks in furtherance of the agreement or understanding which Brooks had with this defendant to defraud the United States.

If you will return to the jury room, we will have the reporter try to find the postions of the transcript which relate to Exhibit 18.

(Time noted: 10:40 p.m., jury retires)

MR. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, the testimony of Morris Brooks with regard to the check was on page 54 and page 55 of the transcript. It's page 54 at line 6 --

THE COURT: Yes, I see it. Do you agree,

Mr. MacBeth?

MR. MacBETH: Yes, beginning at line 6 on 54 and ending on line 11 on 55.

MR. GOLDMAN: 24.

MR. MacBETH: Yes. Then of course there is testimony today from Mr. Rosenblatt and Mr. Rankel.

THE COURT: Where does it end on page 55?

MR. GOLDMAN: Line 23, the last answer with

regard to that.

THE COURT: Is that agreed?

MR. MacBETH: That is agreed, your Honor.

THE COURT: Suppose we bring back the jury.

There is no cross-examination on that.

MR. MacBETH: There was examination today, testimony today from Mr. Rosenblatt and from Mr. Rankel on that check. I cross-examined Mr. Rosenblatt on it.

(Recess)

THE COURT: The reporter indicates that the other minutes of the transcript this afternoon are locked up in the court reporters' room and he doesn't have the key and the guard's key doesn't fit that door. So we will have to read those minutes in the morning. Call them back and read the portions that we do have.

MR. MacEETH: Could I suggest that we read the whole thing at one time. I think that is important so they see the testimony about the check in its entirety.

MR. GOLDMAN: This portion may clarify the question that they have.

MR. MacBETH: I would certainly insist that if this is read that the other portion be read as well that the jury has asked for, and the government strenuously objects to reading only one portion without the other

1 2

bsas48

portion. The government would prefer to read all of it.

THE COURT: Was the other portion different from what is testified to here?

MR. MacBETH: Yes. The other portion,

Mr. Rosenblatt says he can't remember anything about this,

and I then show him the check and he says he hasn't been

around these official checks to make it out, and Mr. Rankel

comes back and says Mr. Rosenblatt was there when the check

was made out, and since it's only endorsed with two

endorsements Mr. Rosenblatt received the money from him.

MR. GOLDMAN: Rabbi Rosenblatt testified that he had no recollection to the specifics regarding these particular checks.

MR. MacBETH: I think he said he didn't have anything to do with those official checks. I think it's an important piece of testimony.

THE COURT: All right. It's five minutes to eleven now. We could wait until the morning. The bus is ordered for 11. Bring in the jurors.

MR. GOLDMAN: May I just ask this? I think the essence of the question -- I may be wrong -- the clarification is as to who got the money, and we do have the testimony as to who got it, and I think that is the issue. I think Mr. MacBeth is asking to have the jury sleep on an

error ous impression. I don't believe that serves any purpose.

MR. MacBETH: I am asking them to have the complete testimony as to the check. They asked for the testimony as to the check. It was broadly put, asking for clarification, and didn't have the fact that the question was put squarely to Mr. Rosenblatt and then it was contradicted by the testimony of Mr. Rankel -- it would be an entirely erroneous objection. The government strenuously objects to any procedure to read only this testimony and not the subsequent testimony.

THE COURT: We would read it in the morning. You are insisting it all be read together?

MR. MacBETH: I think it's much better to read it together so the jury sees it all.

MR. GOLDMAN: Can we ask the jury if they want that portion that we have read? That might answer their question. If not, we can go forward from there.

MR. MacBETH: It's a patent effort, your Honor,
by the defense not to have the colloque today come in
before the jury again. I don't blame them. If I was
faced with the testimony from Mr. Rosenblatt and Mr. Rankel,
and I was in the defense shoes, I'd do the same thing.
I don't think it's fair to the jury and I don't believe it's

2 proper.

THE COURT: We will wait until the morning. Bring in the jury.

(Jury present at 10:55 p.m.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the court reporter has attempted to find the testimony, all of it, relating to Government's Exhibit 18. He finds only a portion of it. The remainder is locked in the court reporters' room and there is not a key available for that now.

We will have to recess until tomorrow morning when he can get the remainder of the testimony relating to Exhibit 18.

We have arranged for buses to take you home at 11, in any event. So if you will return to the jury room and return tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, we will resume the deliberations.

(Time noted: 11:00 p.m.)

THE COURT: Let me caution you about discussing the case other than in the jury room. Please do not discuss it with anyone any time for any reason. Please report to the jury room in the morning.

(Jury excused at 11 p.m.)

THE COURT: We will recess until 10 o'clock

1 bsas51

2 tomorrow morning.

(Adjourned to August 13, 1976, at 10:00 a.m.)

532 bsas52 1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 2 76 Cr. 142 - against -3 ELYAKIM G. ROSENBLATT 4 5 New York, New York August 13, 1976 6 7 8 (Trial resumed) THE COURT: I believe the reporter indicates 9 that the appropriate portions of the transcript have now 10 been obtained, and we will bring in the jurors and read 11 to them --12 MR. MacBETH: Could we just agree on what those 13 are? I also believe there is some on page 68 that we 14 didn't locate last night that probably should be read, and 15 there are a couple of typographical errors that we should 16 clear up. 17 THE COURT: All right. 18 MR. MacBETH: There are two on page 68, your 19 Honor, in line 15 it reads, "At that time I took eight 20 thousand fifty." It should be \$8,500. 21 Then at the beginning of line 16 it says 4000. 22 It should say 1000. 23

THE COURT: Line 16 should be 1000?

MR. MacBETH: Yes. And I believe that the

25

1	bsas53
2	relevant testimony there runs from line 9 through line 23.
3	THE COURT: Do you agree, Mr. Goldman?
4	MR. GOLDMAN: Yes, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: What else is there? The first page
6	were what, again, 58 or 54?
7	MR. GOLDMAN: 54, line 6, through 55, line 23.
8	MR. MacBETH: We have page 68.
9	THE COURT: Do we have something in addition?
10	MR. MacBETH: 356 line 25 through 357 line 16.
11	358 lines
12	MR. GOLDMAN: 357 line 17?
13	MR. MacBETH: 16.
14	MR. GOLDMAN: What about the rest of it?
15	MR. MacBETH: We will put in more if you would
16	like. It goes on to the other government's exhibits.
17	We would be happy to continue it through line 13 on
18	page 358.
19	MR. GOLDMAN: That's perfectly appropriate.
20	359 line 19 through 360 line 10. Then 407 line 24
21	through 408 line 14.
22	THE COURT: Is that all of it?
23	MR. GOLDMAN: As far as I know, your Honor,
24	yes.
25	THE COURT: All right. We have an agreement

1	bsas54
2	from both parties as to what it is. Let's bring in the
3	jury.
4	(Jury present at 10:15 a.m.)
5	THE COURT: We have now located in the transcrip
6	the appropriate portions of the record relating to
7	Government's Exhibit 18 which the reporter will now read.
8	(Record read)
9	JUROR NO. 9: Who are you referring to, Brooks
10	or the Rabbi
11	THE COURT: Would you please read it again,
12	just start again three or four sentences back.
13	(Record read)
14	THE COURT: All right. You may return to the
15	jury room.
16	(At 10:25 the jury retired to resume
17	deliberations.)
18	THE COURT: We will recess.
19	(Recess)
20	(Time noted: 10:50 a.m.)
21	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we have
22	another note from the jurors, which will be marked Court's
23	Exhibit C, which reads as follows:
24	"We have reached a verdict."
25	Bring in the jury.

(Court's Exhibit C marked)

(Jury present at 10:55 a.m.)

THE CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, please answer as your names are called.

(Roll called, all answer present.)

THE CLERK: Madam forelady, have you agreed upon a verdict?

THE FORELADY: We have.

THE CLERK: How do you find the defendant Elyakim Rosenblatt?

THE FORELADY: We the jury find the defendant Rabbi Rosenblatt guilty as charged.

THE CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, listen to your verdict as it stands recorded. You say you find the defendant Elyakim Rosenblatt guilty as charged, and so say you all.

(All answer in the affirmative)

MR. GOLDMAN: May we have the jury polled, your Honor?

(The jury was polled. All jurors answered in the affirmative.)

THE COURT: All right, thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. I understand that your jury service has now been completed and that the clerk has

available for you your certificates of service, which he will hand to the forelady and she will pass them out in the jury room.

You are excused now with the thanks of the Court.

(Jury discharged)

THE COURT: All right. At this time we will set the date of sentence for Friday, September the 24th, at 11 o'clock.

MR. MacBETH: Your Honor, I believe that

Mr. Rosenblatt is on \$10,000 personal recognizance bond.

The government would be willing to continue that bail but would ask for the surrender of Mr. Rosenblatt's passport.

THE COURT: Do you have a passport,

Mr. Rosenblatt?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

MR. MacBETH: In that case, there is nothing to surrender. The government is willing to continue the present bail.

MR. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, may we have thirty days in which to make motions with regard to this case?

THE COURT: Yes, that will be all right.

MR. GOLDMAN: Your Honor, I would like to state to the Court at this time that despite the outcome

of the trial I would like to thank the Court for its consideration in the proceedings.

THE COURT: Thank you, gentlemen.

I just want to indicate on the record that a presentence report will be required.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK			
	x		
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA -against-	:	76 Cr. 142	(CBM)
ELYAKIM G. ROSENBLATT,	~:		
Defendant.			
	: x		

DEFENDANT'S REQUESTS TO CHARGE

The defendant requests that the Court include in its charge to the jury the following instructions:

EFFECT OF AN INDICTMENT

Throughout the trial, reference has been made to the indictment, and the fact that the defendant has been indicted. An indictment is merely the mechanism by which criminal charges are made and by which a defendant is brought to court. An indictment has no probative value whatsoever, and the fact that one has been filed in this case is of no consequence. The indictment is merely a legal prerequisite, a document which must be filed before a defendant is brought to trial in this Court.

CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES

You are to determine to what extent you believe, or do not believe, each of the witnesses. There are various rules and guidelines to help you in making these credibility determinations, although your sharpest tool is probably common sense. You should consider the conduct, appearance and demeanor of each witness on the stand; his frankness or lack of frankness; inconsistencies between his testimony and any previous statements he may have made; his general character as indicated by his past history and conduct; any possible motive he may have had for testifying the way he did; the factual probability or improbability of his testimony; and his opportunity for observation or acquisition of information with respect to the matters about which he testified.

REQUEST NUMBER 2-a

CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES WHO HAVE PREVIOUSLY BEEN CONVICTED OF A CRIME

(It is respectfully submitted that this instruction follow that requested in Number 2, "CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES".)

In this respect, you will recall that one of the witnesses, Morris D. Brooks, acknowledged that he had previously been convicted of certain crimes. This evidence was submitted to assist you in considering the credibility of his testimony, and the weight to give it. The admissions of the witness on this score does not disqualify him as a witness nor automatically compel disbelief of his testimony. Such conduct, however, constitutes a major factor to be given serious consideration, along with all the others I have mentioned, in assessing his credibility.

REQUEST NUMBER 2-b

CO-CONSPIRATOR-ACCOMPLICE TESTIMONY

(It is respectfully submitted that this instruction follow that requested in Number 2, "CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES".)

One of the witnesses who testified, Morris D. Brooks, is alleged by the Government to have been a co-conspirator of the defendant.

"In the prosecution of crime the Government is often called upon to use witnesses who are accomplices in the commission of the crime itself. This is particularly so in cases of conspiracy. Conspirators do not publicly proclaim their intentions to operate openly. It often happens that only members of the conspiracy have evidence which is relevant to and important in the case.

"However, experience has shown that accomplices may be motivated to place the responsibilities on others than themselves. Accordingly, an accomplice's testimony should be closely examined, weighed with care, checked with the facts which you find to exist in this case, and against the evidence which may corroborate them, and then you should give the testimony such value or weight as you deem

important under the circumstances.

"In the Federal Courts accomplice testimony by itself may be sufficient to convict if, but only if, it convinces you of the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

"It is, of course, proper for you to consider the interest which a witness has in the outcome of a case. . . All witnesses are to be judged by the same standards. But in determining the credibility of a witness, his interest in the outcome of the case is certainly a matter you are entitled to take into consideration. I do not mean to suggest that a witness who has an interest in the outcome of the case may not be telling the truth in spite of his interest, but you may consider that factor in determining what weight to give his testimony."

¹ Charge of Lasker, J., approved in <u>United States v. Projansky</u>,
465 F.2d 123, 136-137 (2d Cir.), <u>cert.denied</u>, 409 U.S. 1006
(1972).

REQUEST NUMBER 2-c

MOTIVE TO TESTIFY

(It is respectfully submitted that this instruction follow that requested in Number 2, "CREDIBILITY OF WITNESSES".)

You will recall that one of the witnesses, Morris D. Brooks, testified that he was charged with crimes and pleaded guilty and that he cooperated and gave information to the Government in the hope, at least in part, that he would be treated more favorably than might otherwise be the case.

You may consider these facts as constituting a motive for Brooks to testify as he did, and have a right to be skeptical about his testimony in view of these considerations. This constitutes another factor to be given serious consideration, along with the others I have mentioned, in assessing his credibility.

UNTRUTHFUL WITNESS

I charge you further that, if you find that any witness has lied in a material respect, you have a right to disregard all of his testimony. Although you do not have to believe anything he said, it is within your province to dissect such testimony; in short, to credit that portion which you believe.

PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE

In our system of law there is a fundamental principle known as the presumption of innocence. This means that every defendant charged with the commission of a crime, is presumed to be innocent. The protection of that presumption stays with a defendant throughout the trial and is only removed if and when you, the jury, are convinced of his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

Because of this presumption, it follows that the defendant is not required to prove his innocence. The Government bears the burden of establishing beyond a reasonable doubt each and every element of the crime charged and the defendant's commission thereof. This is the burden the law places upon the prosecution and it remains with them throughout the trial.

REASONABLE DOUBT

Now, what do we mean by reasonable doubt? It means exactly what the words imply. A reasonable doubt is a doubt based upon reason; a doubt for which a juror can give a reason if called upon to do so in the juryroom; a doubt based upon evidence or lack of evidence in a case. A reasonable doubt is an actual doubt; a doubt which one is conscious of having after considering and analyzing all the evidence. If you should have such a doubt concerning the guilt of the defendant, he would be entitled to a verdict of not guilty.

Bear in mind, however, that a reasonable doubt may not be based upon some type of whim, guess, surmise or conjecture. Nor should it be deemed a shield behind which a juror may hide in order to avoid doing a disagreeable duty.

The Government is not required to establish guilt beyond any or all doubt, or to a mathematical certainty.

However, the law does demand proof to a moral certainty, and, if the Government fails to sustain that burden, the defendant is entitled to an acquittal.

CONSPIRACY -- VENUE

(It is requested that this charge be given in conjunction with the Court's instructions as to the elements of conspiracy.)

As I have told you, one of the elements of this crime which the Government must prove is that an overt act committed in furtherance of the conspiracy by one of the conspirators took place in the Southern District of New York.

Manhattan is in this district, but Queens is not. Therefore, the Government must prove that at least one act that took place in Manhattan was done in furtherance of the conspiracy.

The only testimony concerning acts that took place in Manhattan was that relating to the making of false entries and stealing of the checks by Brooks. You must therefore find that one of those acts was committed in furtherance of the conspiracy.

An act committed in furtherance of a conspiracy is one committed in execution of the common, agreed upon purposes as understood by the other conspirators. If the act does not fall within the scope of the unlawful project, or is merely

a ramification of the plan which could not be reasonably foreseen by the other conspirators as a necessary or natural consequence of the agreement, then it is not an act in furtherance of the conspiracy. Thus, if you find that the falsification of the postal records by Brooks, or his stealing of the checks, was in furtherance of the conspiracy as I have defined that term, you may find that the Government has proved that element of the crime charged. If, however, you find that the commission of those acts by Brooks was not in furtherance of the conspiracy, this element will not have been proven, and you must acquit the defendant.

¹ Adapted from Pinkerton v. United States, 328 U.S. 640 (1946).

CONSPIRACY -- AGREEMENT

(It is requested that this charge be given in conjunction with the Court's instructions as to the elements of conspiracy.)

you must find that the alleged conspirators, Brooks and the defendant, agreed to cooperate in achieving the same object. If you find that one of the conspirators had one object in mind, such as defrauding the Government by stealing postal checks, while the other had a different object, such as defrauding the Government by, for instance, helping to evade taxes, then there was no conspiratorial agreement, and this element has not been proven. You must then acquit the defendant.

REQUEST NUMBER 2-a

CONSPIRACY -- AGREEMENT

(It is requested that this charge be given in conjunction with the Court's instructions as to the elements of conspiracy only if the charge requested in Number 7 is rejected.)

The gist of the crime of conspiracy is an agreement, and as I told you, one of the elements of this crime is that the conspirators, in this case Brooks and the defendant, agreed to perform an illegal act or a legal act by unlawful means.

The agreement alleged in this case is one to defraud the United States. The defendant is not charged with conspiring to cash checks or take a percentage of checks that may have been cashed. Those acts are not illegal or unlawful, and one who does them, even if he agrees or conspires with another to do them, is not guilty of a crime. It is only if you find that the defendant agreed to defraud the United States that you may find this element of the crime charged to have been proven.

REQUEST NUMBER 7-b

CONSPIRACY -- AGREEMENT

(It is requested that this charge be given in conjunction with the Court's instructions as to the elements of conspiracy.)

But when a person with whom another conspires secretly intends not to go through with the plan, neither party can be convicted of conspiracy because there was no agreement between two persons. A person who is duped into acting, not agreeing to the object of his actions, is not a conspirator. 2

Wechsler, Jones and Korn, The Treatment of Inchoate Crimes in the Model Penal Code of the American Law Institute: Attempt, Solicitation, and Conspiracy, 61 Colum.L.Rev. 951, 966 (1961).

² Woo Wai v. United States, 22 F.412 (9th Cir.1915).

CHARACTER EVIDENCE

The defense has introduced evidence of Rabbi
Rosenblatt's reputation in the community for honesty,
veracity and integrity. The purpose in introducing such
evidence is to show that it would be unlikely that a person
with this character should commit the crime charged. You
are instructed that evidence of good reputation is admissible
for this purpose, and that you should consider this evidence
along with all the other evidence in the case in determining whether the Government has proved the defendant's
guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

You are further instructed that the circumstances
may be such that evidence of a good reputation alone and
without more may create a reasonable doubt about the
defendant's guilt, although without it the other evidence would
convince you that he is guilty

Respectfully submitted,

KUH, SHAPIRO, GOLDMAN, COOPERMAN & LEVITT, P.C.

Attorneys for Defendant

Robert E. Goldman Andrew R. Cooper

Of Counsel

August 12, 1976

.a.)	Titted States District Court of
,	1 THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MEN YORK 1
C 99%9447 .	
	1 26 VALUE C. 10 25 Chart 1 1 2 2 1 76 Cr. 142
305	THE PARTY OF THE P
	for the personne of the retail eye of the property of the property of the personnel of the
C. tree	SECT. AS LOUNS, I was also as a second of the control of the contr
	CX. For the SEASEL B POCESSY COLDMAN, ESQ
PLEA	Lacons of factual basis for the plea.
	There being accession/verdict of { \(\frac{1}{2} \) \(\frac{1}{2
FINDING 3	Defendant his been convicted as charged of the offense(s) or conspiring to defraud the United States. (Title 18, United States Code, Section 371).
	as charged
fine	The court sixed whether detendant had anything to say why judgment should not be pronounced. Because no sufficient cause to the contrary was shown, or appeared to the court, the court adjudged the defendant guilty as charged and convicted and ordered that: The defendant is receive committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his authorized representative for imprisonment for a period of SIX (6)—MONTHS. The defendant is fined\$8,000, The fine of \$3,000 is a committed and the defendant is to stand comitted until the fine is paid or he is
SENTENCE	otherwise discharged according to law.
RADITARON	
SPECIAL	# 76,868
SMOITIUNS =C	
MOTTALOSS	tept. 28, 1976
ADDITIONAL EGADITIONS	In addition to the special conditions of probation imposed above, it is hereby ordered that the general conditions of probation set out to on the reverse side of this judement be imposed. The court may though the conditions of probation, reduce or extend the period of probation, and at any time during the probation period or within a mission improbation period of the years permitted by law, may issue a warrant and revoke
PROBATION	probation for a solution occurring during the probation period.
	The cours orders commitment to the custody of the Attorney General and Hoommends, It is ordered that the Clerk deliver
	the figure of the U.S. Mar-
Umilia 4	SEP 3 B 107
	DISTRIC
SIGNED BY	CONCENSED NAMES NOTE OF
ry in a se	CONSTANCE BAKER NOTLEY SEP 24 1976
RAYMOND	

016

ROBERT B. FISKE JR.
NOVE 4 1970

U.S.
SOLDISTION N. Y.